

(5)
5.

A
D E F E N C E
OF THE
EXPOSITION of the DOCTRINE
OF THE
Church of England,
Against the
E X C E P T I O N S
OF
Monsieur de *M E A U X*,
Late Bishop of Condom,
AND HIS
V I N D I C A T O R.

The Contents are in the next Leaf.

L O N D O N,

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the *Rose and Crown*
& in *S. Paul's Church-Yard.* MDC LXXXVI. *ꝛ*^R

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

LIBRARY

CHICAGO, ILL.

EXCISE

CHICAGO, ILL.

CHICAGO, ILL.

CHICAGO, ILL.

THE CONTENTS.

- I. **T**HE *Preface*: containing a farther account of *Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition*, with an Answer to his *Exceptions* against my former *Preface*.
- II. The *Defence* of my *Exposition*; being a full Reply to whatsoever has been alledged against it by the *Vindicator*: particularly as to the *false citations*, he pretends, of Their *Authors*, and *misrepresentation* of their *Tenets*.
- III. *Appendix*: Being a *Collection* of some *pieces* relating to this *controversie*, viz.
1. The account of *Monsieur de Meaux's Pastoral Letter*, taken out of the last *Nouvelle*, &c.
 2. A summary of Father *Craffets* Doctrine, of the *Worship* of the B. *Virgin*.
 3. The Opposition between *Card. Bona* and *Monsieur de Meaux* in the same point.

The Contents.

4. A Copy of *Monsieur Imbert's* Letter to *Monsieur de Meaux*, giving him an account of his being persecuted by the A. B. of *Bourdeaux*, for maintaining the *Doctrine of his Exposition*.
 5. The Letter of *S. Chrysostom* to *Casarius*, suppress'd by some Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, for being contrary to their *Canon* of *Transubstantiation*; with an Account of that whole transaction.
 6. An account of *Authors* cited by me, with their *Editions*, to prevent any new *Calumnies*.
-

T H E

THE PREFACE.

M*T former Treatise of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, has given so full an account of the Occasion and Design of Monsieur de Meaux's Book, as might supersede the Necessity of adding any more upon that subject. But being called to a necessary justification of what I there advanced, not so much by the weak defence of his Vindicator, embarked with him in the same Cause; as by the flat denial of Monsieur de Meaux himself, of the principal foundation on which that Account was built; I hope I shall need no great Apologie, if upon this Occasion I enter somewhat farther upon a new History than might otherwise seem absolutely necessary for my defence, and by comparing this method of Expounding with some others of a different Nature, which have of late been sent abroad by those of the Roman Communion, endeavour to shew what the real intent of them all has been; and what the design of those who now pursue the same Method among us, may reasonably be supposed to be.*

It is I presume at this time not unknown to any, what great Endeavours have been used in our neighbour Nation, for the reducing of those of the Reformed Religion to the Roman Communion. And

it must be confess'd indeed, they have omitted nothing that Language and Sophistry could be made to do, for the Attainment of so great an End.

The Jansenists were some of the first who began this work: and it is not to be doubted but that Persons of their avow'd reputation in point of Learning, and who seem'd to have had this means only left them to regain the favour of their King, whose design they pursu'd; would be sure to offer something worthy themselves, and proportionable at once both to the Work it self, and to their Engagements to it.

*La perpetuité
de la foy de
l'Eglise Catho-
lique, touchant
l'Eucharistie.
Ann. 1664.*

The first Attempt they made was a little piece, that has since given Occasion to a very long Controversie between Monsieur Arnauld and Monsieur Claude; of the Perpetuity of the Faith as to the real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. A Tract which if we regard only the neatness and subtilty of the composure, it must be avow'd scarce any thing ever appear'd more worthy that Applause it met with in the World: And the design, though express'd in one particular only, yet so applicable to all the rest; that were the Argument good, the Church of Rome would have needed no other defence for all the corruptions that had, or could possibly creep into it.

But the Sophistry of this method has been sufficiently exposed in the Volumes compos'd on this occasion. And indeed without entring on a particular Examination, any Mans own reason will tell him at first sight, that a Logical subtilty advanced against matter of Fact, may be worth the considering for the curiosity of the undertaking, but like the Philosopher's Argument against Motion, will never be able to convince any, but such as want Diogenes's demonstration to expose its Sophistry.

The Preface.

iii

In effect, the design of this first Method amounted to thus much ; That Transubstantiation (and the same might have been said of any other point in dispute) was visibly once the common Doctrine of the Church : And 'tis impossible it should have been so then, had it ever been otherwise before. And this to be believed upon the strength of a sophistical Argument, notwithstanding all the evident instances of matter of Fact, which Monsieur d'Aubertine and others have at large collected to the contrary.

*Albertinus de
Eucharistia
Sacramento.
Fol.*

The next Attempt, and that as useful and universal as the former, was by another of the same party, and with no less applause, whether we regard the novelty of the invention, or the neatness of the performance : And his Method was, by advancing certain matters of fact, which he calls just prejudices against the Calvinists, to shew that without entering into dispute about any of the points in debate, the bare external consideration of the Protestants in the manner of their Reformation, and some other particulars, was enough to shew, that the truth could not possibly be on their side.

*Préjugés légitimes
contre les
Calvinistes.
An. 1671.*

*But alas ! this too proved an Argument too weak to stand the first examination that was made of it : and Monsieur Pajon, who undertook the defence of his Party against it, has shewn that in his proof he has not only advanced an Argument that might indifferently be brought against all sides, but which a * late Author has since proved, to be ten times more strong against themselves, than it could ever be thought to be against us.*

*Examen du
livre qui porte
pour titre, Pré-
jugés légitimes,
&c. An. 1673.*

** Monsieur Ju-
rieu Préjugés
légitimes contre
le Papisme
An. 1685.*

I shall not undertake an exact account of all the other Methods that have succeeded these, with less Applause, and as little Effect. One, as is said by

B

the

*Les Pretendus
Reformez con-
vaincus de
Schisme. 1684.*

the same Author, was published not long since to prove us guilty of Schism in separating from the Church of Rome, whether we had sufficient grounds or not for our so doing: And that for this reason, because however the learned Men of our party might have been convinced of the reasonableness of it, yet the generality being incapable of forming such a judgment, must have separated without reason, and so have been Schismatics. And if their Separation was at first unlawful, their Return will now by consequence be necessary to them.

How far this method might heretofore have concluded with those whom it principally concerns, the vulgar and ignorant, I cannot tell; but God be thanked there are few now so ill instructed in their Religion, but what will have enough to free them from the sin of Schism, if the knowledge of a sufficient reason of their Separation may be allow'd to do it.

Thus much only I will beg leave to observe on occasion of these several methods that have been proposed for our Conviction, That the great design of them all has been to prevent the entering on particular Disputes, which had hitherto been the way, but such as experience had taught them to be the least favourable of any to them.

And the same is the design of the late peaceable method set forth by Monsieur Maimbourg; in which from the Authority of the Church in matters of Faith, confess'd, as he says, by us, he proves, That the Church, in which both parties once were, must then have had this Authority over us all; and to whose decision in the Council of Trent, we all by consequence ought to submit.

The Preface.

v

It is not necessary that I should here say any thing to shew the Weakness and Sophistry of these several Methods: That has been the business of those particular Examinations, that have with success enough been made of them. This I suppose may at first sight appear upon the bare proposal of them, That they have more of Ingenuity than of Solidity in them; and were, no doubt, designed by their Inventors, to catch the unwary with a plausible shew of that Reason, which the Wise and Judicious know them to be defective in.

How far we may conclude from hence, as to the Nature and Design of Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition, I shall leave it to others to consider. This is undeniable, That as it came out at a time when these kind of Methods were all in repute, and with a design to help forward the same great business of Conversion then in agitation; so has it been cry'd up by those of that Communion as exceeding all others in order to that End; and if we may believe their reports, been above all others the most happy and successful in it.

It is not easie to conceive that a Person of Monsieur de Meaux's Learning, should seriously believe, That a bare Exposition of their Doctrine should be sufficient to convince us of the truth of it. He could not but know that our first Reformers were Persons abundantly qualified to understand the real profession of a Church in which they had been born and bred; and in which many of them were admitted to holy Orders, Priests and professors of Divinity. Nor is the Council of Trent so rare or so obscure, that a meer Exposition of its Doctrine should work such effects, as neither the Council nor its Ca-

Advertisement
Pag. 2, 4.

techism were able to do. In a word Monsieur de Meaux himself confesses, His design was to represent his Church as favourably as he could; to take off that 'hideous and terrible form in which the Ministers, he says, were wont to represent Popery 'in their Pulpits, and expose it in its natural dress, 'free from those frightful Idea's, in which it had so long been disguised by them.

One would imagine by this discourse that the whole business of the Ministers of the Reformed Religion, was to do nothing but invent new Monsters every day, and lay them to the Church of Rome: And that after all our pretences to Peace and Union, we were really such Enemies to it, that we did all we could, even by Lies and Calumnies, to keep both our selves and the people from it. But indeed these hideous Idea's Monsieur de Meaux speaks of, if they are such false representations as he pretends, they are not the Ministers that invent them; but their own greatest Zealots, their Schoolmen, their Bishops, their Cardinals; nay their very Popes themselves that have been the Authors of them.

How far Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition differs from what they have delivered us as the Doctrine of their pretended Catholick Church, has been in some measure shewn already, and shall in the following Discourse be more fully evidenced. And whosoever shall please to consider the Elogies and Approbations, which these Men have received, no less than Monsieur de Meaux, will be forced to confess it to be at least a disputable point, Whether the Ministers, from these Authors, have represented their Church in a hideous and terrible form; or whether Monsieur de Meaux rather has not, instead

stead of removing the Visor to shew her in her natural dress, a little varnish'd over her Face to hide her defects, and make her appear more charming and attractive than her own natural deformity would otherwise permit her to do.

Now of this a more convincing proof cannot, I think, be desired, than what I before advanced, and see no reason yet to retract; viz. "That out of an extraordinary desire of palliating, he had proceeded so far, as in several points wholly to pervert the Doctrine of his Church. Inasmuch that when his Book was sent to some of the Doctors of the Sorbonne for their approbation, they corrected so many places in it, that Monsieur de Meaux was forced to suppress the whole Edition, and change those places that had been mark'd by them, and put out a new and more correct Impression, as the first that had ever been made of it.

Exposit. Pag. 3.

This Monsieur de Meaux is pleas'd to deny as an utter falsity; "For that he never sent his Book to the Sorbonne; that their custom is not to License Books in Body; and that that Venerable company knows better what is due to Bishops, who are naturally and by their Character the true Doctors of the Church, than to think they have need of the Approbation of her Doctors. In a word, that it is a manifest falsity to say that a first Edition of his Book was suppress'd, because the Doctors of the Sorbonne had something to say against it. That he never did publish, nor cause to be printed, any other Edition than that which is in the hands of every one, to which he never added nor diminish'd one syllable; nor

Vindicat. Pag. 8, 9.

“nor ever fear’d that any Catholick Doctor could find any thing in it worthy of reprehension.

This is indeed a severe charge against me, and such, as, if true, it cannot be doubted, but that I have been as great a Calumniator as his Vindicator has thought fit to represent me ; or, as for ought I know, Monsieur de Meaux himself will be in danger of being reputed if it should be false. And therefore to satisfy the World in this main, fundamental point between us , I do hereby solemnly declare, “That there was an Impression of the Exposition, such as I spake of ; That out of it I transcribed with my own hand, the several Changes and Alterations that are placed at the end of my Preface ; That this Book, with these differences is at this time in the hands of the Reverend Editor of my former Treatise, and that whosoever of either Communion is pleased to Examine them, may when ever he will have free liberty so to do.

This I the rather declare, because Monsieur de Meaux is so positive in it, as to charge me with no less than the pure Invention of those passages I have cited from it. “As for those passages, says he, which they pretend I have corrected in a second Edition for fear of offending the Sorbonne, it is as you see a Chimerical Invention ; and I do here once more repeat it, That I neither publish’d, nor conniv’d at, nor caus’d to be made, any Edition of my Book, but that which is well known, in which I never altered any thing. For answer to which I must beg leave once more to repeat it too ; “That these passages are for the most part Chimerical Inventions indeed, but yet such as He once hop’d to have put off as the Doctrine of his Church, and as such

such sent them into the World, in that first Edition we are speaking of; out of which I have transcribed them in as just and proper terms as I was able to put them in; and I appeal to any one, that shall please to examine them, for the truth and sincerity that I have used in it.

*But here Monsieur de Meaux has got an Evasi-
on, which, if not prevented, may in some Mens Opi-
nion take off this seeming contradiction betwixt us,
and leave us both at last for the main in the right!*
“Tis true, says he, this little Treatise being at
“first given in Writing to some particular Persons
“for their Instruction, many Copies of it were dis-
“persed, and IT WAS PRINTED with-
“out my Order or Knowledge. No body found
“fault with the Doctrine contain’d in it; and I my
“self without changing any thing in it of Im-
“portance, and that only as to the Order, and
“for the greater neatness of the Discourse and
“Stile, caused it to be printed as you now see.
*So that now then it is at last confess’d that an Edi-
tion there was, such as I charged them with, dif-
ferent very much from what we now have.* “But that
“it was an Edition printed without Monsieur de
“Meaux’s Knowledge; and the changes which he
“made afterwards were only as to the Order, and
“for the greater neatness of the Discourse and
“Stile.

*As to this last particular, the Reader will best
judge of what kind the differences were, by that short
Specimen I have given of them. If to say in One,*
“That the Honour which the Church gives to
“the Blessed Virgin and the Saints is Religious,
“nay that it ought to be blamed if it were not

“Religious;

Collect. n. 2.

Ibid. n. 12.

"Religious; In the Other, to doubt whether it may even in some sense be called Religious: If to tell us in the One, "That the Mass may very reasonably be called a Sacrifice; In the Other, that there is nothing wanting to it to make it a true Sacrifice. If to strike out totally in several places, Positions that were absolutely of Doctrine, or otherwise very material to the Points that were so; as in several instances it appears he has done; If this were indeed only for the advantage of the Order, and for the greater neatness of the Discourse and Style, I am contented. I accuse not Monsieur de Meaux of any other alterations than such as these.

And thus far we can go certainly in Reply to his Allegations, beyond a possibility of denial: For what remains, though I do not pretend to the like Evidence of Fact, yet I will offer some Reasons why I cannot assent to his pretences even there neither.

That the Impression was made with Monsieur de Meaux's Knowledge, if not by his express Order, whoever shall consider the circumstances of Monsieur Cramoisy who printed it, either as a Person of his Reputation and Estate; or as Directour of the King's Imprimerie; or finally as Monsieur de Meaux's own Bookseller; will hardly believe that he would so far affront a Bishop of his Church, and one especially of Monsieur de Meaux's interest and authority at that time at Court; as to make a surreptitious Edition of a Book, which he might have had the Author's leave to publish only for the asking.

But further: This pretended surreptitious Edition had the Kings Permission to it, which could hardly have

have been obtain'd without Monsieur de Meaux's knowledge. It was approved by the Bishops of France in the very same terms that the other Editions have been since; which seems more natural to have been procured by Monsieur de Méaux himself, than by a Printer, underhand, and without his knowledge and concurrence. In a word, so far was Monsieur de Meaux from resenting this injury, of setting out his Book so uncorrectly, and without his leave; that the very same Cramoisy, the same Year, Printed the Exposition with his leave, and has continued to Print all his other Books ever since; and was never that I could hear of, censured, for such fraudulent dealing, till this time, by the Bishop or any other. All which put together, I must beg leave still to believe as I did before; that there was not only a first impression, which is at length allow'd; but that this first impression was not made without Monsieur de Meaux's Order or Knowledge.

As for the other Point, and I think the only remaining in this matter, concerning the occasion I mentioned for the suppressing that first Edition; the Reader may please to know, That a Person by many relations very intimate with one of the Marechal de Turenne's Family, upon the publishing of the pretended first Edition of Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition, first discover'd to him the mystery of the former, and shew'd him out of the Marechal's Library the very Book which, as he then assured him, had been mark'd by some of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, and lent it him for some time as a great Curiosity. The knowledge of this raised the desire of endeavouring, if it were possible, to retrieve a Copy of it: But the Edition was so carefully dispatch'd, that the most that could be done was to get so many scatter'd Sheets of it, as to make at last a perfect Book, ex-

cept in some few places in which it was transcribed from the Original of the Marechal, word for word, page for page, and examined by the Person himself, who was so kind as to bestow it on me.

This is the Book to which I refer the Reader ; and for this I have the Attestation of the same Person under his hand, at the beginning of the Book ; that it is in every part a perfect Copy of Monsieur de Turenne's mark'd by the Sorbonne Doctors ; and I have been besides so just to Monsieur de Meaux, as to cite scarce any thing out of those places that were in the Manuscript part, but have chosen such rather where the printed Copy gave me full Assurance and Authority to do it.

But to argue the improbability of all this, Monsieur de Meaux observes, " That the Sorbonne is never used to License Books in Body. And I desire Monsieur de Meaux to tell us, who ever said or thought they did ? " That that venerable Company knows " better what is due to Bishops, who are naturally " and by their Character Doctors of the Church, " than to think they have need of the Approbation " of her Doctors. I doubt not but the Sorbonne very well knows the respect that is due to Bishops : but that it should be any argument of disrespect to approve a Bishop's Book, when it was sent to them for that purpose, I cannot conceive. In short, we understand the Reputation and Authority of that venerable Company too well, to believe it at all improbable that Monsieur de Meaux should desire their Approbation ; nor are we so little acquainted with their Books, as not to know, That it is no unheard of thing to see Doctors of the Sorbonne setting their approbation to a Book, approved and authorized by Bishops before.

Vindicat.
Pag. 8.

The

The next Exception Monsieur de Meaux makes, is, That I should confirm what had before been urged against him, of a Papist's answering his Book; in the truth of which I am as little concern'd as himself can be. Only the assurance I have had of it from a Person of undoubted sincerity, makes me still believe that it was so: and Monsieur de Meaux may remember that Monsieur Conrart often profess'd that he had seen it in Manuscript; who was not only his old Friend, but as himself characteriseth him, "One endowed with all that the Catholics themselves could desire in a Man, excepting a better Religion.

Vindicat.
Pag. 9.

M. de M's
Advert. p. 3.

For what relates to Father Crasset, it is not for me to contradict Monsieur de Meaux's Declaration, that he never read his Book; But that he never heard it mentioned that there was any thing in it contrary to his Exposition: this I must confess is admirable, whether we consider the notoriety of the thing, as it related to the Salutory Advertisements and the Bishop of Tournay's Pastoral Letter, which made so great a noise in France; or that it was particularly proved, in the Answer to his own Advertisement dedicated to Monsieur de Ruigny, above five Years since, to be directly opposite to his Exposition. And for the rest, I must beg leave to believe, whatever Monsieur de Meaux flatters himself with; that that Father would be so far from being troubled that any Body should think his Principles contrary to Monsieur de Meaux's, that I dare say he would rather think his pains but ill spent in Writing of so large a Book, did he not believe he had convinced the World that he looks upon them, nay and has proved them too, to be little less than Heretical.

Seconde Re-
ponse. p. 79, &c.

For all this,
see the Ap-
pendix.
num. 2.

As for Cardinal Capisucchi, Monsieur de Meaux tells us, he is so far from being contrary to the Doctrine

Vindicat.
pag. 10.

See Appendix num. 3, where I have shew'd Cardinal Bona another of his approvers, to be nevertheless in his own Writings contrary to Monsieur de M's Exposition.

Vindicit.
P. 10, 11.

For what concerns Mr. Imbert, see his own Letter to Monsieur de Meaux, Appendix, num. 4. For Monsieur de Witte's case it has been already printed, and I have nothing new to add to it.

Vindicit.
P. 14.

of the Exposition, that his express Approbation has been prefix'd to it. This indeed were a good presumption that he should not have any Principles contrary to Monsieur de Meaux; but if what I have alledged out of his Controversies be really repugnant to what he approved in the Exposition, it may indeed speak the Cardinal not so consistent with himself as he should be, but the contradiction will be never the less a contradiction for his so doing.

The next thing Monsieur de Meaux takes notice of is, The relation of Monsieur Imbert and Monsieur de Witte. The Stories are matters of Fact, and the Papers from whence they were collected published by themselves. If they alledged Monsieur de Meaux's Authority for Principles that he maintained not, this concerns not us; nor, whatever the little Comment on the Bishop's Letter pretends, was it at all needful to be shewn by me that they did not, in the recital of the propositions held by them. 'Tis sufficient that they both declared themselves to stand to Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition; and were both condemned, without any regard had to Monsieur de Meaux's Authority; or being at all convinced, or so much as told, that they were mistaken in their pretences to it.

The last thing Monsieur de Meaux takes notice of is, That I reflect upon him for being "fertile enough" in producing new Labours, but sterile in answering what is brought against his Works. I do not at all envy Monsieur de Meaux's fertility; his productions have not been many, and those so short, and with such an ingenuous Character of temper and moderation as ought to be acknowledged even in an Enemy. But I must confess I do admire, as many others do, that no Reply has been made by him to those Answers

swers that have been sent abroad not only against his Exposition, but even against the Advertisment it self, which he says can bear no Reply. This we so much the rather wonder at, for that an Answer was openly promised by Monsieur de Turenne, and not without some kind of boasting too; And that several of his own Communion were so well satisfied with the pieces that had been publish'd against Him, as to expect, no less than We, some such Vindication.

Sec de la B's.
Answer to the
Advertisse-
ment p. 5.

And here I shall take my leave of Monsieur de Meaux, for whom I must yet again profess, that I still retain all that respect that is due to a Person whose Character I honour, and whom I hope I have treated with all the caution and civility that the necessary defence of my self and of the truth would permit me to do. For what remains, my business now must be wholly with his Vindicator, who has been pleased to fix such an odious Character upon me, as I hope to make it appear I have as little deserved, as I shall desire to return it upon him.

Had he charged me with Ignorance, had he loaded me with mistakes arising from thence; or had he imputed to me the faults only of Carelessness and Incogitancy: All this might have pass'd without my Censure; and I should have been so far from vindicating my self, that I should have been ready, in great measure, to have acknowledged the Charge, and to have submitted to his reproof. I know how little fit I am for controversies of this kind; That neither my Age, nor Learning, nor Opportunities have qualified me for such undertakings, as the defence of my Religion and my duty to my Superiors have, without any design of mine, engaged me in. And I doubt not but a Censor less severe, than he who has thought fit to make himself my Adversary,

Vindicat.
P. 2. 22.

Adversary, *might have found out more real faults in my Book, than he has noted pretended Errors.*

But for the Calumnies and Misrepresentations, for the unsincere dealings and falsifications, he accuses me of, and that in almost every Article; here I must beg leave to justify myself; and assure the Vindicator, whoever he be, that my Religion, I thank God, needs not such defences, nor would I ever have used these means to assert it, if it did.

Ephes. 4. 20.
Rom. 3. 8.

We have indeed heard of some that have look'd upon these things as not only lawful, but even pious on such Occasions; that have esteemed the interest of the Church so sacred, as to be able to sanctifie the worst means that can be made use of to promote it: Had I been bred in their Schools, there might have been some more plausible grounds for such a suspicion; and what wonder if I did no more, than what I had been taught was lawful for me to do? But I have not so learnt Christ. I have been taught, and am perswaded, that no Evil may be done that good may come: I am assured by S. Paul that they who say it may, their damnation is just: And did I now know of any one instance of those crimes, whereof I am represented to the World as guilty in almost every Chapter, I should think myself indispensably obliged to make a publick acknowledgement of it, and thank the Vindicator that has called me to so necessary a duty.

But now that I am not conscious to my self of any thing of all this, all that I have to reply to this uncharitable way of proceeding is, to intreat him by the common name of Christian, and those hopes of Eternity, after which I believe we would all of us be thought sincerely to contend, to consider how dangerous this way he has taken is; what mischief it will bring,

bring, in the opinion of all good Men, of whatsoever persuasion they be, to the very cause that is maintain'd by such means : in a word, what a sad purchase it will prove in the end, if to lessen the reputation of an unknown, obscure Adversary, he should do that which shall lose him his own Soul.

But it is time now to clear myself of those Calumnies that are laid to my charge. And the first is, "That I endeavour to represent Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition as a Book that palliates, and prevaricates the Doctrine of his Church; and the very Approbations of it, as meer artifices to deceive the World, not sincere, much less authoritative Approbations, either of the nature or principles of Monsieur de Meaux's Book."

I do not remember I have any where in express terms charged Monsieur de Meaux with prevaricating the Doctrine of his Church in the latter Editions of his Book ; though others I know have done it. But however, if this be the greatest of those Calumnies I am guilty of, I am sure all that have ever lived among them, and seen their practices, and compared them with what he writes, will easily absolve me : and I shall hereafter shew that either Monsieur de Meaux has palliated, or else the greatest of their Authors have strangely perverted the Doctrine of the Church.

*As to the other part of the Accusation, that I should say that the Approbations were meer Artifices to deceive the World, it is not my Calumny, but the Vindicator's mistake. I never thought those Letters Monsieur de Meaux has published any authoritative Approbations of his Book at all ; Indeed in the place which he cites, I have said somewhat like it of the *Popes Brief, and am still of the same mind ; and till he*

*Vindicat.
pag. 2.*

*Expos. of the
C. E. pag. 15.*

** Of which see
more in the
Appendix.
n. 3. P. 120.*

shall

Vindicat.
pag. 3.

shall think fit to answer the reasons that induced me to believe so, he will hardly persuade me that this is a Calumny.

"But if I am so little satisfied with the Approbations of Monsieur de Meaux's Book, I should at least have had some more authentick testimonies of what I my self publish. And he thinks it wonderful, that my Book should have found such a reception as it did, only from my assuring the World that I had not palliated, nor prevaricated the Doctrine of the Church of England; but submitted it to her Censure; and the sight of an Imprimatur; when the Approbations of so many Learned Men, and even of the Pope himself, are not thought sufficient to secure Monsieur de Meaux's Treatise.

This indeed were somewhat, if the truth of the Exposition were on either side to be taken from the number of the Approvers, and not the nature of the Doctrine. If Monsieur de Meaux has really palliated the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, 'tis not any number of Approbations that will be able to render him a faithful Expositor. If my Exposition be conformable to the Doctrine of the Church of England; (and if not, let him shew us the prevarications;) the want of a few Letters can at most argue only my interest not to have been so great as his, or my Vanity less; but will not render the Exposition ever the more unfaithful. And though an Imprimatur be all the Authority that is usual with us on such Occasions, yet the Vindicator may believe, by the reception he acknowledges the Book to have had, that it would have been no difficult matter to have obtained other Subscriptions than that of the Reverend Person

son who Licensed it; and if that will be any satisfaction to him, I do assure him, it has been approved by several other Persons but little inferiour, whether in Authority or Reputation, to any Monsieur de Meaux has prefix'd to his Exposition.

For what remains of my Preface, two things there are which he supposes worthy his Animadversion: One, that "whereas I accuse Cardinal Capisucchi to have contradicted the Doctrine of the Exposition, we must take notice, that the Bishop of Condom's intention was not to meddle with Scholastic Tenets, but purely to deliver that Doctrine of the Church, which was necessarily and universally receiv'd; whereas Cardinal Capisucchi being obliged to no such strictness, would not, it may be, contradict the problematical niceties of those Schools in which he had been Educated.

Vindicator.
Pag. 17.

It is the Catholic distinction of this Author throughout his whole Vindication, if any thing be alledged contrary to his liking, that it is presently a Scholastic Tenet, and not the necessary and universally to be receiv'd Doctrine of the Church. But that we may, if possible, discern what is the Doctrine, and what the Scholastic Tenet in the present case, we will take only what at first sight offers it self, viz. That Cardinal Capisucchi do's positively affirm, † "That a Divine worship may be paid to Images, upon the account of the thing which they represent; and that this Doctrine was never doubted of in the Church, nor deny'd by the Council of Trent.

† To satisfy the Vindicator what the Cardinal's words are, I will give them at length. Ex his constat & in concilio Niceno Secundo, & in Tridentino, aliisque, Latram duntaxat Idololatricam Sacris imaginibus denegari, quatenus

lep Gentiles Imaginibus exhibent, ac proinde Latram illam interdici que Imaginibus in seipsum & propter ipsas exhibetur, quasque Imagines (eu Numina aut Divinitatem continentia more Gentilium colantur; de huiusmodi enim Latram controversia erat cum Judæis & Hæreticis, qui hæc ratione nos Imagines colere asserbant. Ceterum de Latram illi que Imaginibus S. Trinitatis, Christi D. aut Sacratissima Crucis exhibetur, ratione rei per eas representate, & quatenus eam re representant à hominibus in esse representativo, nullamque divinitatem Imaginibus tribuit aut supponit, nulla unquam fuit aut esse potuit Controversia. Art. 8. p. 647.

*Monsieur de
Meaux's Ex-
pos. pag. 8.*

*Vindicat.
pag. 19.*

Does Monsieur de Meaux allow of this ? Does he tells us that a Divine Worship may upon any account be paid to an Image ? Or rather does he not plainly insinuate that he can hardly allow the Image any honour at all ; “ We do not, says he, so much honour the “ Image of an Apostle or Martyr, as the Apostle “ or Martyr in presence of the Image. Let us then lay aside the barbarous distinctions by which he would excuse a foul Idolatry ; Be it a School nicety, or whatever you will else, “ Whether the representative I- “ mage as representative, be representatively one “ and the same with the thing represented : Our Question without this Gibberish is plain and intelligible ; Whether, upon any account whatsoever, the Image of our Saviour or the Holy Cross be to be worshipped with Divine Worship ? This the Cardinal affirms ; and this if Monsieur de Meaux does allow, let him speak it out without mincing ; If not, ’tis plain for all the pretences of a Scholastic nicety, that they differ in the Exposition of a very material point of the Doctrine of the Roman Church.

*Vindicat.
p. 16, 17, 19.*

The other thing which the Vindicator thinks fit to take notice of in my Preface, is the Consequence which I draw from this, and some other instances of the like kind, viz. “ That the Papists think it law- “ ful to set their hands to, and approve those Books, “ whose Principles and Doctrine they dislike.

In Answer to which, he again distinguishes between Scholastic Tenets, and matters of Faith : and then tells us, “ Every one knows that the Doctrines of “ a Church or matters of Faith, being Tenets ne- “ cessarily and universally received, ought upon “ no account to be dissembled or disguised ; but as “ for Scholastic Opinions, we see not only one Na- “ tion commanding one thing to be taught, and “ another

"another the quite contrary; but even one University against another in the same Country, &c.

But if I mistake not, this is not to answer my Conclusion, but to start a new Question. The Point proposed was, not whether in matters that are not of Faith, Men may not hold different Opinions, and yet live still in the same common Church, whereof there can be no doubt, but it was a Conclusion drawn from plain matter of fact, viz. That those of the Church of Rome think it lawful to set their hands to, and approve those Books whose principles they dislike. This the Instances I have brought shew plainly they do; If they know it to be a sin, and yet do it, they condemn themselves; If they think otherwise, then they believe it to be lawful; which is all I affirm'd, and to which the Vindicator has answered never a word.

There is yet one thing more remaining before I close this; and that is the remark the Vindicator has made upon the passages collected by me out of Monsieur de Meaux's first Edition, which have either been altered or omitted in the following Impressions: viz.

That the Bishop in that Edition had been so far from proposing the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, loosely and favourably, as I pretend; that on the contrary he rather proposed it with too much strictness: In a word, that he had been so far from perverting the Doctrine of the Church, that I was not able to propose one Doctrine so perverted, without a forced interpretation of my own, according to my wonted way of turning all things to a wrong intention.

As to the first of which, no one ever charged the Bishop with proposing the Doctrine of the Church of Rome loosely and favourably in every point. We know well enough that in some, he has kept to the

plain Doctrine of his Church, as in that of the Eucharist: in others proposed it rather with too much strictness, as in the case of Infants dying unbaptized: All we say is, that in some other Articles, such as the Invocation of Saints, Worshipping of Images, Sacrifice of the Mass, &c. he had expounded it more loosely and favourably than he ought to have done, and that without any gloss or interpretation of mine to turn things to a wrong intention.

Collect. n. 5.

Does not the Church of Rome lay any Obligation on particular persons to joyn with her in the Invocation of Saints? Does she condemn those only who refuse it out of Contempt, and with a spirit of dissention and revolt? This Monsieur de Meaux once affirmed, and I think there needs no comment to shew, that this is to palliate the Doctrine of their Church.

Ibid. n. 6.

Has the Church of Rome ascribed no other vertue to Images, than to excite in us the remembrance of those they represent? Is that all the use they make of them? Do they not so much honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, as the Apostle or Martyr in presence of the Image? Or rather, did not Monsieur de Meaux here also mollifie the known Doctrine and practice of his Church?

Ibid. n. 12.

In a word: Is the Church of Rome contented to teach only that the Mass may very reasonably be called a Sacrifice? Is that Exposition reconcileable to what we now read in him, "That there is nothing wanting to make it a true Sacrifice. May I not here at least, without my wonted way of turning all things to a wrong intention, beg leave to say, that either Monsieur de Meaux palliated the Doctrine of his Church in that, or he has otherwise perverted it in this?

Had

Had Monsieur de Meaux only retrenched or altered some things in his Book, for the greater exactness of the Method or neatness of Stile; he must have been a very peevish Adversary indeed, that would have pretended to censure him for that. But to change not only the words but Doctrine too; to give us one Exposition of it in one Edition, and a quite contrary in another, this I think may, if not be represented as a heinous crime, yet at least deserve a remark; and let the Vindicator do what he can, will I doubt make the Author pass with all indifferent persons, for such as yet I had never represented him, had not he himself first made the dilemma, viz. "One that either did not sufficiently understand the Doctrine of his Church, or that "had not sincerity enough to expound it aright.

Vindicat.
Pag. 21. 22.

M. de M's
Advert. p. 2.

I should now pass to the consideration of those Exceptions that have been made against what I have advanced in my Book it self; but before I do this, it will be requisite that I take notice of those directions, the Vindicator has thought fit to give me in his Postscript, in order thereunto.

And here, not to deceive either his, or the Reader's expectation; I must beg leave to excuse my self from entering any farther into dispute with the Bishop of Condom, than I have already done. I never designed a direct answer to his Book; and the reflections I have made upon it in my former Treatise, were more to clear the Doctrine of the Church of England, than to argue against what he offered in behalf of the Romish Faith. This has been the undertaking of another Pen, from whom the Vindicator I suppose may expect, what is reasonably enough refused by me.

Vindicat.
pag. 120, 121.

"But:

Vindicat.
pag. 121.

Ibid.

"But for the other part of his desire, that I would take the pains to peruse my self the Authors cited by me, and not transcribe Quotations, nor take up things by halves; I have been so scrupulous in observing it, that I doubt I shall receive but little thanks from himself for it. It cannot be deny'd but that there have been faults enough committed on both sides for want of this care, and I do not desire to add to the number. "I have done my best to take nothing of them without a serious Examination of their sense, and a sincere application of it to the point in Question. How far I have attain'd this I must leave it to others to judge; but for the rest, the truth of my Citations, I have been so cautious in them, that allowing only for the Errata's of the Press, I desire no favour if I am found faulty in that.

I should indeed stand in need of a large Apology to those, into whose hands these Papers may chance to fall, that I have in many places run them out into so great a length: But the Accusation that has been brought against me for want of doing this before, how unjust soever it be, has obliged me to this Caution now; and they are so ordered as to be no hindrance to those that are minded to pass them by.

Vindicat.
pag. 122.

This benefit at least I shall attain by them, with those who please to compare them with what the Vindicator alledges; that they will find he might have spared himself the troublesome, and ungentile Office indeed of undertaking what he could not effect, "to demonstrate to the World the unsincerity which I have shewn in my Quotations, and the falsifications of them; His endeavours wherein have been so very unsuccessful, that I know not whether himself or his Religion will suffer more by the weakness of his attempt.

A
T A B L E
 OF THE
A R T I C L E S
 Contained in the following
T R E A T I S E.

P A R T I.

I.	I <i>Introduction.</i>	Page 1.
	II. <i>That Religious Worship is terminated only in God.</i>	6
	III. <i>Invocation of Saints.</i>	ibid.
IV.	<i>Images and Reliques.</i>	14
V.	<i>Justification.</i>	25
VI.	<i>Merits.</i>	28
VII.	1. <i>Satisfactions.</i>	32
—	2. <i>Indulgences.</i>	35
—	3. <i>Purgatory.</i>	36

PART

26
A TABLE.

PART II.

VIII. <i>Sacraments in General.</i>	Page 37
IX. <i>Baptism.</i>	ibid.
X. <i>Confirmation.</i>	39
XI. <i>Penance.</i>	41
XII. <i>Extreme Unction.</i>	42
XIII. <i>Marriage.</i>	52
XIV. <i>Holy Orders.</i>	53
XV. &c. <i>Eucharist.</i>	54
XIX. <i>Sacrifice of the Mass.</i>	67
XX. <i>Epistle to the Hebrews.</i>	69
XXI. <i>Reflections on the foregoing Doctrine.</i>	70
XXII. <i>Communion under both kinds.</i>	71

PART III.

XXIII. <i>Of the written and unwritten Word.</i>	75
XXIV. &c. <i>Authority of the Church.</i>	77
XXVI. <i>Authority of the Holy See.</i>	82
XXVII. <i>The Close.</i>	83

THE

THE EXPOSITION

OF THE
Doctrine of the Church of *England*,
Vindicated, &c.

ARTICLE I.

Introduction.

HE that accuses another of great and heinous crimes, ought to take all prudent care not to be guilty himself of those faults which he condemns in others. Had the *Author* of the *Vindication* thought fit to govern himself by this rule, he would have spared a great part of that *odious Character* he has been pleased to draw of me, in the beginning of this *Article*. But it is not my business to recriminate, nor need I fly to such arts for my justification. Only as to the advantage he proposes to himself from these endeavours, *viz.* to shew that all those Books to which an Imprimatur is prefix'd, will not hereafter be concluded free from Error; He needed not surely have taken such pains for that: For I believe no one before him ever imagined that a permission to print a Book, was a mark of its Infalibility; "Nor that every nameless Author, who professes

Vindicat.
pag. 22.

Vindicat.
pag. 22.

E

"*esses to be sincere, should pass for an Oracle.* It is not to be doubted but that *faults* there might have been in my Book, for all that *priviledge*; though the *Vindicator* has had the ill fortune to miss the most of them. And for ought he has proved to the contrary, I believe it will in the end appear, that an *Imprimatur* *Car. Alston*, is at least as good a *mark of Infallibility* as a *Permissu Superiorum*; and a *Church of England Expositor*, as fit to pass for an Oracle, as a *Popish Vindicator*.

Vindicat.
pag. 23.

But *Calumny* and *Un sincerity* are now the *Catholick cry*: And to make it good against me, I am charged in this one *Article* to have been guilty of both. "*My Introduction is Calumny in a high degree, and my state of the Question, drawn from thence, as unsincere.*"

"*I tell them, he says, of adoring Men and Women, Crosses, Images, and Reliques; of setting up their own Merits, and making other propitiatory sacrifices for sin than that of the Cross: And that these are all contrary to their pretended principles, that Religious worship is due to God only; That we are to be saved only by Christ's Merits, and that the death of Christ was a perfect sacrifice.* The *Logick* of which he is content to own, that the *Consequence* is good, but the *Accusation*, he says, is false, and the charge, *Calumnatory*.

But if in the following *Articles* it be made appear, that *their own Authors* do allow of all this: If they do give a *divine Worship* to the *Blessed Virgin* and *Saints departed*; If their very *Missal* and *Pontifical* do command them to adore the *Cross*; If it appear that their *Council of Trent* damns all those who deny the *Mass* to be a *propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the Dead and Living*, and yet cannot say it is the very same with that of the *Cross*:

Cross: If, finally, their greatest Writers do allow a *Merit of Condignity*, and that not as a *Scholastick Tenet*, but as the *Doctrine* of their *Church*, and agreeable to the *intention* of their *Council* they so much talk of; Then I hope the *premises* may be as clear of the *Calumny* they are charged with, as my *inference* is allow'd to be just, for the *consequence* I would establish.

In the mean time, pass we on to the *state* of the *Question*, which I propose in these terms; Expos. p. 5.
"That we who have been so often charged by the
"Church of Rome as Innovators in Religion, are
"at last by their own confession allow'd to hold the
"antient and undoubted foundation of the Christian
"Faith; And that the Question therefore between
"us is not, Whether what we hold, be true?
"But whether those things which the Roman Church
"has added as superstructures to it and which as such
"we reject, be not so far from being necessary Ar-
"ticles of Religion, as they pretend, that they do
"indeed overthrow that truth which is on both sides
"allowed to be divine, and upon that account ought
"to be forsaken by them?"

"This the Vindicator says, is to state the Que- Vindicat.
pag. 24.
stion after a new Mode, and represent them as con-
senting to it. Let us see therefore what the Old
way of stating it is, and wherein the insincerity he
charges me with, consists.

The true state of the *Question* betwixt us, he Ibid. p. 25.
says, is, *"Whether the Protestants or Papists do in-*
"novate? The Protestants in refusing to believe
"those Doctrines which the Church of Rome pro-
"fesses to have received with the grounds of Chri-
"stianity, or the Papists in maintaining their pos-
"session: And the dispute is, Whether Roman Ca-
tholicks

Ibid. p. 26.

"*tholicks ought to maintain their possession, for which, he says, many Protestants themselves grant they have a prescription of above 1000 Years? Or whether the Authorities brought by Protestants against the Roman Catholick Doctrine be so weighty, that every Roman Catholick is obliged to renounce the communion of that Church in which he was bred up, and quit his prescription and possession.*"

In all which the only difference that I can find is this; That He presumes for his Church in the state of the *Question*, I for mine: I suppose the points in *Controversie* to be *Superstructures* which they have added to the Faith; He, that they are *Doctrines received with the grounds of Christianity*. In short, the point we both put upon the issue is precisely the same; *viz. Whether the Roman Catholicks ought to maintain their possessions of these Doctrines, or to quit them as Erroneous? Whether Protestants to embrace the belief and practice of them as true and lawful, or to continue, as they are, separate from the Roman Communion upon the account of them?*

See his *Expos.* §. 2: p. 2.

But where then is my *unsincerity*? In this I suppose, that I seem to insinuate as if the Roman Church granted that we held the ancient and undoubted foundation of the Christian Faith. What others of that Communion will grant, I cannot tell; but who so shall please to consider *Monsieur de Meaux's* arguing from *Monsieur Daille's* concessions as to this Point, will find it clear enough that he did; if the Foundation consists of *Fundamental Articles*, and that we are on both sides agreed in these, as his discourse manifestly implies. But the *Vindicator*, jealous for the Authority of his Church, and to have whatever she proposes

poses pass for *Fundamental*, confesses that we do indeed hold a *part*, but not all those *Articles* that are *Fundamental*. This therefore we must put upon the issue, in which we shall not doubt to shew them; that those *Articles* their *Church* has added, are so far from being *Fundamental Truths*, that indeed they are *no Truths at all*; but do by *evident* and *undoubted consequence*, as I before said, and as the *Vindicator* himself confesses, destroy those *Truths* that are on both sides agreed to be *Fundamental*.

Vindicat. Pag.
23.

But if I have not mistaken the *Question* between the *Papists* and *Protestants*, I am sure the *Vindicator* has that between *Him* and *Me*. "He tells us our present *Question*, which we are to examine in the following *Articles*, is, *Whether* "Monsieur de Meaux has faithfully proposed the "sense of the Church declared in the Council of "Trent? And thereupon asks me, *What it do's* "avail me to tell them, *That I will in the following* "Articles endeavour to give a clear and free Account of what we can approve, and what we dislike in their *Doctrine*? To which I reply, That it avails very much to the end I propounded in my Book, viz. To give a true "*Exposition of the* "*Doctrine of the Church of England in the several Points proposed by Monsieur de Meaux*. So that in reality the *Question* between us is this, Not whether *Monsieur de Meaux* has given a true *Exposition* of the *Doctrine of the Church of Rome*, which it has been the business of others to examine; but whether I have given a just account of the *Doctrine of the Church of England*. This was what I undertook to do, and what this *Author* ought, if he could, to have shewn I had not done.

Vindicat.
pag. 26.

A R T.

ARTICLE II.

That Religious Worship is terminated only in God.

IN this *Article* I am but little concern'd. The *Vindicator* states the Case, what 'tis they mean by *Religious honour being terminated only in God*. He distinguishes between what they pay *Him*, and what they give to the *Saints*; how truly, or to what purpose, it is not my business to examine. Those who desire to be satisfied in it, may find a sufficient Account in several late Treatises written purposely against this part of *Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition*; and I shall not repeat what is so fully and clearly established there.

ARTICLE III.

Invocation of Saints.

I Might well have pass'd over this *Point* altogether, which has been so learnedly and fully managed, but very lately, in a particular † Discourse on this Subject. Yet since the *Vindicator* desires to know what Authority I have for my *Affertion*, "That the *Addresses* which *Monsieur Daillé* allows to have been used by the *Fathers* "of the fourth *Century*, were rather *innocent wishes* "and *rhetorical flights*, than *direct Prayers*; but "especially for that *Accusation* which he says I bring "against them, *viz. That they did herein begin to de-*
"part

† Discourse concerning the Worship of the B. Virgin and the Saints, in Answer to Monsieur de Meaux's Ap-
 peal to the fourth Age.

Vindicator,
 Pag. 29.

"part from the Practice and Tradition of those before them, I am content to give him that satisfaction.

For the First then: That Monsieur Daillé himself look'd upon them as no other than such *Addresses* as I have characterized, because * *Monsieur de Meaux* has represented him as if he allow'd that the custom of *praying to Saints* was *establi'd in the Church in the fourth Century*; I then cited his *Opinion* to the contrary, and have now subjoyn'd it in his own words †.

* *Expos. Monsieur de Meaux, p. 4. §. 3.*
It will not be unuseful to take notice how those of the P. Re-

formation begin to acknowledge, that the custom of *Praying to Saints* was established even in the fourth Age of the Church. Monsieur Daillé grants thus much in that Book he publish'd against the Tradition of the Latin Church, about the Object of Religious Worship. † Monsieur Daillé's words are these: Neque eum à vero longè aberraturum puto, qui dixerit hunc fuisse apud Christianos primum ad Sanctos invocandos gradum, cum calefacti atq; inardescerent rerum præclarè ab iis gestarum meditatione, prædicatione, atque exaggeratione animi, ad eos denique Invocandos prorumperent. Certè que de 4^o Seculo prima hujus Invocationis afferuntur Exemplar, sèrè sunt hujus generis. Ex Encomiasticis quorundam disertissimorum & Eruditione Seculari florentissimorum hominum in Sanctos Orationibus desumpta, Gregorii Nazianzeni in Cyprianum; in Athanasium, in Basilium; Gregorii Nysseni in Theodorum, qui ambo 4^o sed jam præcipiti seculo celebres habebantur, &c. Adv. Lat. Tradit. de cultus relig. Objèctio, l. 3. c. 18. pag. 454.

Secondly: That these *Addresses* were really of this kind, the several passages that are usually brought from these *Fathers*, plainly shew: And both the * *Examples* I gave, and the *differences* I assigned, do abundantly prove it.

* The Examples I gave were from

Greg. Naz. and they are these: 1. Invektiv. in Julian. pag. 2. He thus bespeaks Constantius. Άλλοι κ' η τω μεγάλω Κωνσταντίνω Ιουλιανώ, (ει τις αἰδουσι) ὅσαι τε πρὸς αὐτὸν βασιλέων φιλόφρονι. Upon which the Greek Scholiast observes ἰσοκετακτὸν αὐτῷ τῷ. εἰαν τις αἰδουσι ἔστι τῷ τῷ δὲ ἀδελφῷ. 2dly. Orat. 11. in Gorgon. p. 189. l. D. He thus addresses to his Sister. εἰ δὲ τις σὺ κ' τῷ ἡμετέρῳ ἔστι λόγος, κ' τὸτο ταῖς ὁσίαις ψυχαῖς ἐκ θεῶν ἡγείας, τῷ ποιῶντι ἐπαιδευέας, Νίχοι κ' τ' ἡμέτερον λόγον ἀντὶ πολλῶν κ' πρὸς πολλῶν εὐπείων.

That they could not have allow'd of such an *Invocation* as is now practised in the Church of Rome, I proved from this plain *Argument*, " * That they believed that the *Saints departed*, were not admitted " to the sight of God immediately upon their decease; " and

* The opinion that the souls of just

men do not go straight to Heaven, seems to owe its rise to the Verses of the

“and therefore, by the Papists own † Confession, ought to have believed that they could not be pray’d to. To all which the *Vindicator* is pleas’d to re- turn never a word.

Sibylls; which being very ancient (within 140 years after Christ) and by the most primitive Fathers taken for *A. theutick*, drew the whole stream of the Writers of those times into the same mistake. *Blondel* in his Book of the *Sibylline Oracles* affirms l. 2. c. 9. p. 103. That all the Authors we have left us of the Second, and as far as the middle of the Third Age, were of that Opinion: And adds that even in the following Ages many of those very men *Monsieur de Meaux* has alledged for the *Invocation of Saints*, were involved very far in the same Error; viz. *S. Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom* and *S. Augustine*. This is yet more fully shewn by *Monsieur Dai’lè* in his Book of *Cult. rel. Obj. l. 3. c. 22. p. 474. & seq.* and in another of his Books of *Pœmis & Satisfact.* where to the Fathers last mentioned he adds *S. Jerom l. 5. cap. 4, 5, 6.* All which *Sixtus Senensis* himself confirms, *Bib. l. 6. smor. 345. p. 569.* and particularly as to the Fathers in question, *S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine. p. 571, 572.* † *Bellarm. de Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 19. p. 2044. l. D. Not. 12;* quia ante Christi adventum Sancti qui moriebantur non intrabant in Cœlum, nec Deum videbant, nec cognoscere poterant ordinariæ preces supplicantium, ideo non fuisse consuetum in T. V. ut diceretur *S. Abraham Ora pro me.* See again c. 20. p. 2060. l. B. Sect. atque ex his duobus, collat. cum pag. 2059. l. D. Sect. alii dicunt. The same is Suarez’s Opinion T. 2. in 3. D. Th. disp. 42. Sect. 1. p. 435. col. 1. l. E. Quod autem aliquis directè oraverit Sanctos defunctos ut se adiuvarent, vel pro se orarent, nulquam legimus. Hic enim modus Orandi est proprius legis Gratiæ, in quos sancti videtores Deum possunt etiam in Ea videre Orationes que ad ipsos fiunt. And this the common Doctrine of their Writers,

In short, That the Fathers of the fourth Century did herein begin to depart from the Practice

- and Tradition of the Ages before them, I proved from this, “† That they are not able to produce any one instance of the three first Centuries of any such Invocation; but rather have * been forced to confess that nothing of that kind was to be found among

† This I before chal- leng’d the Answerer to do, and he has not at- tempted it.

Bellarmine has but two within the first 300 Years. One of *Irenæus* mis-interpreted. and one of *Hilary*, as little to the purpose. *De Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 19. p. 2047, 2048.*

* So Cardinal *Perron* himself *Repl. à la resp. du Roy de la grande Bretagne, liv. 5. cap. 11, 19.* Where he is forced to *Monsieur de Meaux*’s Shift of concluding from the following Ages what he could not prove from the preceding; and at last to confess freely, p. 1009. *Quant aux Auteurs plus proches du siècle Apostolique, des quels la perfection nous a varié la plupart des écrits, encore qu’il ne s’y trouve pas des Vestiges de cette coutume — il s’agit qu’il ne se trouve rien en leurs Ecrits de repugnant à l’Eglise de 4. premiers Conciles, pour ce regard.* Which is no more than *Monsieur de Meaux* himself insinuates, where to this very Assertion of *Monsieur Laillè*’s I have made use of, he has only this to say, That ’tis not likely that *Monsieur Drille* should at this distance understand the sentiments of the Fathers of the first three Centuries better than those of the next Age did, *Expos. Sect. 3. p. 4.* All which he allow’d in express terms in his suppressed Edition. See my *Collect. n. 3 p. xxiii.*

them

Invocation of Saints.

them. Besides that the *Maxims* of those *Fathers* concerning † *Prayer* were such, as are utterly repugnant to such an Invocation.

† I shall mention but two ;
1st, That they constantly de-

fined *Prayer*, as due to God only: Προςωμοῦ ἀρνέσας ἀγαθῷ Θεῷ ἢ ὑποκλίνεσθαι εἰς ἄνδρα, says Basil. Θεὸς ἡμῶν, Greg. Nyssen. ὁμολογεῖς πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, Chrysostom. ἀρνέσας τὸ προσκύνειν Θεῷ καὶ ἄνθρωπον, Damaſcen &c. And, *adly*, That it was the great *Argument* used by S. Athanasius, and the other Fathers of these Times, to prove our Saviour to be God, that he was prayed to.

These were the *Arguments* I then offer'd; to which the *Vindicator* would have done more justly to have try'd if he could have made some Reply, than after all this to cry out, as if nothing had been said, "*What Authority does he bring for his Assertion?*" *Vindicat. p. 29.*
 "By what Authority does he condemn these Prayers,
 "these innocent Wishes and holy Raptures, as he calls
 "them, as fond things, vainly invented? &c.

And now that I have satisfied his demand, may I in my turn ask him, Where it is that I condemn those innocent Wishes, and holy Raptures, of these Fathers, as fond things, vainly invented? That I do, with our Church, censure their Invocation of Saints as such, is confess'd; but that I pretend to pass any judgment at all upon these holy Men, is false; nor was it any way necessary that I should do it.

As for the *Authority* he requires for our refusal *Vindicat. p. 30.* of this Invocation, it were very easy to shew it, had I nothing to do but to repeat things, that have been so often said already, that the World grows weary of them; and is abundantly satisfied that they have nothing to reply to them. Every Text of Scripture that appropriates Divine Worship to God alone, is a demonstration against them; and that one Passage of St. Paul, Rom. 10. 14. How shall they call upon him

Invocation of Saints.

in whom they have not believed? were not Men willing to be contentious, might end the *Controversy*. And for the *Antiquity* which he speaks of, What can be more ridiculous, than to pretend *prescription* for that which has not the least *foundation*, neither in *Holy Writ*, nor *Primitive Christianity*; of which not one Instance appears for the first three hundred Years after *Christ*, but much to the contrary.

He that desires a fuller satisfaction in these Points, may please to recur to that excellent *Treatise* I before mention'd, and which may well excuse me that I say no more about it. Only because this was one of the Points, in which I promised to shew, that they do adore *Men and Women* by such an *Invocation* as cannot possibly belong to any but *God only*; and that they make the *Merits* of their *Saints* to run parallel with the *Merits of Christ*, insomuch as for their *Merits*, to desire that their very *Sacrifices* may be *accepted*, and their *Sacraments* be available to them; I will subjoin a short *Specimen* of every one of these out of their *Publick Rituals*, to shew that there was neither *Falshood* nor *Calumny* in my *Accusation* of them.

Appendix to ARTIC. III.

A Specimen of the Church of Rome's Service to Saints, taken out of their Publick Liturgies.

AS to the *Prayers* they make to them ; we find them thus addressing to the *Blessed Virgin* :

1. *We fly to thy Protection, O Holy Mother of God, despise not our Prayers which we make to thee in our Necessities, but deliver us from all Dangers, O Ever-glorious and Blessed Virgin.* *Offic. B. V. p. 84.* And in one of their *Antiphona's* ; 2. *Vouchsafe me that I may be worthy to praise thee, O Sacred Virgin ; Grant me strength and Power against thine Enemies.* *Ibid. p. 103.* 3. They desire her conjunctly with our Saviour, to bless them. *Ibid. p. 105.* And in their 4. *Hymns*, they address to her in the most formal manner ; that she would *help them that fall* ; that she would *have pity upon Sinners* ; 5. that she would *protect them against the Enemy*, and *receive them at the Hour of Death.* I shall add only one Prayer more, part of which I before mention'd, and will

1. Sub tuum
refugium con-
fugimus S. Dei
Genetrix ; no-
stras deprecations ne de-
spicias in ne-
cessitatibus, sed
à periculis
cunctis libera-
nos semper
Virgo gloriosa
& benedicta.
2. Dignare me
laudare Te
Virgo Sacra-
ta ; Da mihi
Virtutem con-
tra hostes tu-
os.
3. Nos cum
prole pia, be-
nedicat Virgo Maria.
4. Alma Redemptoris Mater, quæ pervia Cœli Porta manes, &
stella maris, succurre cadenti Surgere qui curat populo ; tu quæ genuisti Naturâ mirante
ruium Sanctum Genitorem, Virgo prius ac posterius, Gabrielis ab Ore Sumens illud Ave,
Peccatorum miserere. *Offic. B. V. p. 122.* 5. Maria Mater gratiæ, Mater miserecordiæ,
Tu nos ab hoste protege, & horâ mortis suscipe. *Ib. p. 123.*

|| *Bellarmin.* I. 1. now repeat it, because || Cardinal *Bellarmino*, and de Sanct. beat. some others are so ashamed of it, as totally to deny c. 16. p. 2036. they have any such Prayer, 6. O Happy Mother, expiating our Sins, By the right of a Mother COMMAND our Redeemer. Grant us the ——— of Faith, Grant us the good Works of Salvation; Grant us in the End of our Lives that we may die well.

quod petimus. At quis nostrum hoc dicit? Cur non probat ullo exemplo? I before observed that *Cassander* owns the Prayer, Consult. Art. 21. And *Monsieur Daillé* assures us, that in the *Missal* printed at *Paris* but in the Year 1634. in libr. Extrem. p. 81. It is still extant in these words; 6. O felix Puerpera, nostra pians scilera, Jure Matris IMPERA REDEMPTORI. Da fidei foedera, Da salutis Opera, Da in vitæ vespërâ Benè mori. And indeed however scrupulous *Bellarmino* is of this Matter, yet others among them make no doubt to say, that she does not only intrat her Son as a Suppliant, but COMMAND him as a Mother. So *Peter Damien*, Sermon. 1. de Nat. Mariæ, speaking to the Virgin, tells her, Accedis ante aureum illud humanæ reconciliationis Altare, non solum rogans sed IMPERANS. For so Father *Crafter*, who both cites and approves it, translates the Passage; Thou comest before the Golden Altar of our Reconciliation, not only as a Servant that Prays, but as a Mother that COMMANDS. And *Albertus Magnus*, Sermon. 2. de laud. Virg. Pro salute famulantium sibi, non solum potest filio supplicare, sed etiam potest Autoritate Maternâ eidem IMPERARE. That for the Salvation of those that serve Her, the Virgin cannot only intrat Her Son, but by the Authority of a Mother can COMMAND Him. This Father *Crafter* proves from more of the like stuff, in his 1. Part. Trait. 1. Qu. 8. p. 60, 61. concluding the whole with this admirable Sentence; "Eadem potestas est Matris & Filii, quæ ab omni potente Filio omnipotens facta est: The Power of the Mother and the Son is the same, who by her OMNIPOTENT Son, is made her self O MNIPOTENT.

This is the last French Divinity, approved by the Society of the *Jesuits*, published with the King's Permission; and espoused at a venture by *Monsieur de Meaux* in his Epistle.

Nor is it the Blessed Virgin only to whom they thus address: The Prayer to St. John is in the same strain: 7. "That he would loose the Guilt of their polluted Lips, that the Tongues of his Servants might sound out his Praise. And in general, thus they address to

7. Ut queant
laxis resonare
fibris, Mira
gestorum fa-
muli tuorum,
Solve polluti labiivratum, Sancte Johannes.

Of the Church of Rome's Service to Saints.

r3

the Apostles and Evangelists: "8 O ye just Judges,
 "and true Lights of the World, we pray unto you with
 "the Requests of our Hearts; That you would hear the
 "Prayers of your Suppliants. Ye, that by your Word
 "shut and open Heaven, We beseech you deliver us, by
 "your Command, from all our Sins. You, to whose
 "Command is subjected the Health and Sicknes of all
 "Men, Heal us who are sick in our Manners, and restore
 "us to Vertue; that so when in the end of the World
 "Christ the Judge shall come, He may make us partakers
 "of Everlasting Joy.

8 Vos sacri
 iusti Iudices &
 vera Mundi lu-
 mina, vobis pre-
 camur cordium,
 audite preces
 supplicum. Qui
 Cælum verbo
 clauditis, se-
 rasq; ejus sol-
 vitis, Nos à
 peccatis omnibus
 solve Jussa
 quæsumus, Quo-
 rum præcepto
 subditur salus

& languor omnium, Sanate Agros moribus, Nos reddentes Virtutibus. Ut cum iudex advenierit
 Christus in fine sæculi, Nos sempiterni gaudii, Faciat esse compotes. ibid. p. 497.

For the next Point, the Merits of their Saints,
 'twere infinite to repeat the Prayers they make of this
 kind. I will subjoyn two or three. In the Feast of
 St. Nicholas, Dec. 6th: 9 O God who hast adorned thy
 Bishop, St. Nicholas, with innumerable Miracles, grant
 we beseech thee, that by his Merits and Prayers, we may
 be delivered from the Fire of Hell. Offic. B. Virg. p.
 561. And many there are of this nature all along
 their Office.

9 Deus qui B.
 Nicolaum Pon-
 tificem innu-
 meris decora-
 sti miraculis,
 tribue quæsu-
 mus ut ejus
 Meritis & Pre-
 cibus à Gehen-
 næ incendiis
 liberemur.

But since the main question is about their recom-
 mending to God their Offerings, and Sacraments, by
 the Merits of their Saints; we will see that too.
 And for an instance of these we need go no farther
 than their very first Saint, 10 St. Andrew, to whom
 in their Secretum they thus address. "We beseech thee,
 "O Lord, that the Holy Prayer of the Blessed Apostle,
 "St. Andrew, may procure thy Favour to our Sacrifice;
 "that as it is solemnly offer'd in his Honour, so it may
 "be rendred acceptable by his Merits, through our Lord.
 He that shall survey the following Festivals, will

10 Sacrifici-
 um nostrum
 tibi Domine
 quæsumus B.
 Andreæ Apostoli
 precatio sancta
 conciliet, ut in
 cujus honore
 solemniter ex-
 hibetur Ejus
 Meritis effici-
 tur acceptum.
 Per. Missale
 Rom. Fest. Nov.
 p. 513.

find

11 Ut hæc
Munera tibi
Domine ac-
cepta sint S.
Bathildis ob-
stant Merita;
quæ seipsam
tibi hostiam
vivam, sanctam
& beneplacen-
tem exhibuit.

12 Præstent nobis quæsumus sumpta Sacramenta præsidium salutare, & interve-
nientibus B. Martini Confessoris tui atq; Pontificis Meritis ab omnibus nos absolvant peccatis.
See Missale in usum Sarum fol. 9. & 68. in Fest. Nov.

find either the *Secretum*, or *Post-communio*, to run in the same strain: I shall instance only in the Saints I formerly mentioned. "11 Let the Merits of St. Bathildis, O Lord, prevail, that our Gifts may be accepted by thee: 12 Let the Sacraments which we have received, we beseech thee, be our saving Defence, and through the Merits of thy Blessed Martyr, St. Martin interposing, absolve us from all Sin.

Such is their *Service* of the *Saints*; How agreeable to that Duty we owe to God, or to the very pretences of *Monsieur de Meaux*, and the *Vindicator*, let the World judg.

ARTICLE IV.

Images and Reliques.

Vindicat. p. 31.

IN this *Article* the *Vindicator* takes notice, and that truly, of my complaining that the approved *Doctrine* of their most reputed *Writers*, should so much contradict what *Monsieur de Meaux* would have us think is their only design in that Service. He tells us that properly speaking, according to the *Bishop* of *Meaux's* sense, and that of the *Council*; The Image of the Cross is to be lookt upon only as a representative, or memorative Sign, which is therefore apt to put us in mind of JESUS CHRIST, who suffered upon

Ibid. p. 32.

"upon the Cross for us; and the Honour which we there
 "shew, precisely speaking, and according to the Ecclesiasti-
 "cal Stile, is not properly to the Cross, but to Jesus
 "Christ represented by that Cross.

To this I opposed the Doctrine of St. Thomas, and
 the Authority of their own Rituals, to shew that they
 "expressly adored the Cross of Christ, and not only
 "Jesus Christ represented by that Cross.

In answer to the former of which, the Doctrine of Vindicat. p. 38.

"St. Thomas, he tells me, that he is not to maintain

"every Opinion held by the Schools: That had I been

"sincere, I ought to have taken notice of the reason

"brought by St. Thomas, and his Followers; which

"shews, that it is purely upon the account of Jesus Christ

"represented, and not upon the account of the Cross it

"self, that he allows Adoration to it. In short, He

"concludes the Doctrine of St. Thomas to be in effect

"the same with Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition, That

"it is an Adoration of Jesus Christ represented by the

"Crucifix, but not an Adoration of the Crucifix it self.

"And the same is the account he gives of the Ponti-

"fical, which he confesses admits of an Adoration in the

"same sense.

For the business of the Pontifical, we shall see more
 particularly hereafter: In the mean time this short
 instance may serve to shew that his Destination is
 purely arbitrary. || In the Order of receiving an Em-

perour, it is appointed, that if there be a Legat pre-
 sent, his Cross shall take the upper hand of the Em-
 perors Sword, because a Divine Worship is due to it.

|| Pontific. Ord.
 ad recip. proces-
 sionaliter Impi-
 rat. p. 205. col. 2
 si vero Legatus
 Apostolicus Im-
 peratorum reci-

peret, aut cum eo Urbem intraret, vel alias secum iret vel equitaret, ille qui Gladium Im-
 peratori præfert, & alius Crucem Legati portans simul ire debent. Crux Legati, Quia debetur ei La-
 tria, erit à dextris, & Gladius Imperatoris à sinistris.

† Thomas 3.
p. 9. 25. art. 4.
Utrum Crux
Christi sit ado-
randa adoratio-
ne LATRIÆ?
Conclus. Crux
Christi in qua
Christus cruci-
fixus est, tum
propter re-
præsentatio-
nem, tum
propter mein-
brorum Chri-
sti contactum,
LATRIA
ADORANDA
EST: Crucis
verò Effigies
in aliâ quâvis
materiâ, prio-
ri tantum ra-
tione LATRIA
ADORANDA
EST. And in
the body, Unde utroq; modo adoratur eâdem adoratione cum Christo, scil. ADORATIONE LATRIA.

† As to St. Thomas, he tells us only this, "That the Cross is not to be adored upon its own account, but either as it is the figure of Christ crucified, or because it toucht his Members when he was crucified upon it: That the Wood of the true Cross is to be worshipped with Divine Adoration upon both these accounts, but any other Crucifix only upon the former. What does all this avail to the pretences of the Vindicator? It shews indeed St. Thomas's grounds for his Conclusion, but we are little concerned in them; nor was it any unsincerity in me not to transcribe all his Reveries. The Conclusion he makes is plain and positive, and neither to be reconciled with the Vindicator's Fancy, nor to be eluded by his Sophistry; "That the CROSS of Christ is to be ADORED with DIVINE ADORATION. What his reason is, we matter not; sure we are, that no good one can be brought by him, or any body else, for it.

The next Argument I made use of was, That in the Office of the Benediction of a new Cross, there are several Passages which clearly shew, that they attribute such things to the Cross, as are directly contrary to Monsieur de Meaux's Pretences, "As that they who bow down before it, may find health both of Soul and Body by it.

This he cannot deny, but charges me with leaving out two words, that he says would have explain'd all, viz. Propter Deum, for the sake of God. It is very certain that I did leave out these words, as I did several others, I believe, as much to the purpose as these. But that I may shew how little reason there

was

Vindicat. p. 39.

Page 39.

was for my expressing them, and to convince the World how clearly this passage charges them with *Adoring the Cross*, I will now propose it in its full length.

In the form of consecrating a new Cross; First the Bishop makes several prayers; "† That God would bless this Wood of the Cross, that it may be a saving Remedy to Mankind; An Establishment of the Faith; for the Increase of good Works, and the Redemption of Souls; a Comfort and Protection against the cruel Darts of the Enemy.

Pontificale de benedictione novæ Crucis. pag. 161. col. 2. † Rogamus Te Domine pater omnipotens sempiternæ Deus, ut digneris benedicere hoc lignum

Crucis tuæ, ut sit remedium salutare generi humano; sit soliditas fidei, bonorum Operum profectus, & redemptio Animarum; sit solamen & protectio, & tutela contra sæva jacula Inimicorum. Per.

After some other Prayers to the same purpose; the Bishop blesses the Incense, sprinkles the Cross with Holy Water, and incenses it; and then Consecrates it in these words:

"* Let this Wood be sanctified in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Let the blessing of that Wood on which the members of our Saviour were hanged, be in this present Wood; that as many as pray and bow down themselves [for God] before this Cross, may find health both of Soul and Body, through the same Jesus Christ. || Then the Bishop kneels down before the CROSS, and devoutly ADORES it, and kisses it.

* Ibid. p. 162. col. 1. Sanctificetur istud lignum in Nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti: Ex benedictione illius ligni in quo sancta membra salvatoris suspensa sunt, sit in isto

ligno, ut orantes inclinantesq; se [propter Deum] ante istam Crucem, inveniant Corporis & Animæ sanitatem: Per.

|| Tum Pontifex flexis ante CRUCEM, genibus ipsam devotè ADORAT & osculatur.

But if the Cross be of any Metal, or of precious Stone, instead of the former Prayer, the Bishop is

G

to

to say another : I shall transcribe only some part of it.

* Ut Sancti-
ficet tibi hoc
signum Crucis
atq; consecres :
— Illis ergo
manibus hanc
Crucem accipe,
quibus illam
amplexus es ;
& de sanctita-
te illius, hanc
sanctifica : &

scienti per illam mundus expiatus est à reatu, ita offerentium famulorum tuorum anime devotissime, huius CRUCIS merito, omni caveant perpetrato peccato. P. 162.

* Tum Ponti-
fex flexis ante
CRUCEM
genibus EAM
devotè ADO-
RAT & oscu-
latur : Idem
faciunt qui-
cunq; alii vo-
luerint.

Vindicat. p. 39.

After a long preamble, they beseech God, * That he would sanctify to himself this Cross, and bless it ; That our Saviour Christ would embrace this Cross, [which they consecrate] as he did that [on which he suffered ;] and by the holiness of that, sanctify This : That as by that the World was redeemed from guilt, so the devout Souls who offer it, may by the Merits of this Cross be freed from all the Sins they have committed.

* Then the Bishop as before, Kneeling down before the CROSS, devoutly ADORES it, and kisses it.

I hope this length will not seem tedious to any who desire a true information of the Doctrine and Practice of the Roman Church in this Matter. And I shall leave it to any one to judge what benefit those two words I omitted, could have brought to excuse such foul and notorious Idolatry. For the rest of my Citations, he passes them over so triflingly, as plainly shews he had nothing to say to them ; “ All the rest of his Expressions, says he, drawn from the Pontifical, are of the same nature ; either lame, or patch’d up from several places, and therefore if they make any thing against us, are not worthy our regarding.

For Monsieur de Meaux, I shall only beg leave to remark this One thing ; that if the Church of Rome looks upon the Cross only as a memorative Sign ; to what End is all this Consecration ; so many Prayers shall I say, or rather magical Incantations ? And how comes

comes it to pass that a *Cross*, without all this ado, is not as fit to call to mind *Jesus Christ* who suffered upon the *Cross*, as after all this *superstition*, not to say any worse, in the *dedication* of it?

My third *Argument* to prove that they *Adored the Cross*, was from their *Good Fryday's Service*: And here I am again accused for not giving *All the words of the Church*, and of adding somewhat that was not there, to make it speak my own sense. The words I cited are these, "*Behold the Wood of the Cross, Come, let us Adore it.*" Whereas their *Church* intends not that we should *Adore it*, i. e. The *Cross*; but *come, Let us Adore*, i. e. The *Saviour of the World* that hung upon it.

To judge aright of this *Cavil*, and yet more expose their *Idolatry*, I shall here give a just account from the *Missal*, of the whole Service of that Day as to this Point. ||

"* The *Morning Prayers* being finished, the *Priest* receives from the *Deacon* a *Cross*, standing ready on the *Altar* for that purpose; which he uncovers a little at the top, turning his face to the people, and begins this *Antiphona*, *Behold the Wood of the Cross*; the People following the rest to *Come, let us Adore*; at which all but the *Priest* that officiates fall upon the ground.

rationibus Sacerdos deposita Casula accedit ad cornu Epistolæ, & ibi in posteriori parte Anguli altaris, accipit à Diacono Crucem jam in altari præparatam; quam versâ facie ad populum à summitate parùm disco-operit, incipiens solus Antiphonam, *Ecce lignum Crucis*, ac deinceps in reliquis javatur in Cantu à Ministris usq; ad *Venite Adoremus*, Choro autem cantante, *Venite Adoremus*, omnes se prosternunt excepto celebrante. Deinde procedit ad anteriorem partem anguli ejusdem cornu Epistolæ, & disco-operiens brachium dextrum Crucis, elevansque eam paulisper, altius quàm primò incipit, *Ecce lignum Crucis*; aliis cantantibus & adorantibus, ut supra.

|| Note first, That in the Office of the Holy Week, printed in Latin & English at Paris, 1679, The Title of this Ceremony is, THE ADORATION OF THE CROSS. pag. 342.

* Missale Rom. feria VI. in Pasce, p. 247. Completis O-

"Then the Priest uncovers the right Arm of the Crucifix, and holding it up, begins louder than before, Behold the Wood of the Cross, the rest singing and adoring as before.

"Then finally the Priest goes to the middle of the Altar, and wholly uncovering the Cross, and lifting it up, begins yet higher, Behold the Wood of the Cross on which the Saviour of the World hung, come, let us adore: the rest singing and adoring as before.

Deinde Sacerdos procedit ad medium altaris, & discoperiens Crucem totaliter, ac elevans eam, tertio altius incipit, Ecce lignum Crucis, in quo salus mundi pendit, Venite Adoremus: alii cantantibus & adorantibus ut supra.

Postea Sacerdos solus portat Crucem ad locum ante Altare præparatum, & genu flexus ibidem eam locat: Mox depositis calcamentis accedit ad ADORANDAM CRUCEM; ter genua flectens antequam eam deosculetur. Hoc facto revertitur, & accipit calcamenta & casulam. Postmodum ministri Altaris, deinde alii Clerici & Laici, bini & bini, ter genibus flexis, ut dictum est, CRUCEM ADORANT. Interim dum fit ADORATIO CRUCIS cantantur, &c.—Deinde cantatur communiter Anna: CRUCEM tuam ADORAMUS Domine. P. 209.

"This done, the Priest alone carries the Cross to a place prepared for it before the Altar, and kneeling down, leaves it there. Then he puts off his Shoes, and draws near to ADORE the CROSS, bowing his Knees three times before he kisses it: which done, he retires and puts on his Shoes. After him the Ministers of the Altar, then the other Clergy and Laity, two and two, after the same manner, ADORE the CROSS.

"In the mean time while the Cross is Adoring, the Quire sings several Hymns; one of which begins with these words, We adore thy Cross, O Lord.

This is the Service of that Day. And now whether I had reason or no to apply, as I did, the Adoration to the Cross, let any reasonable Man consider; and whether I had not some cause to say then, what I cannot but here repeat again, "That the whole Solemnity of that days Service plainly shews, that the Roman Church does adore the Cross in the utmost propriety of the phrase.

As for my last *Argument* from the *Hymns* of the *Vindicat.* p. 40.
Church, he acknowledges the *Fact*, but tells us,
 "That these are Poetical Expressions; and that the
 "word *CROSS*, by a *Figure*, sufficiently known to *Poets*,
 "signifies *JESUS CHRIST*, to whom they pray in those
 "*Hymns*. I shall not ask the *Vindicator* by what
Authority he sends us to the *Poets* for interpreting the
Churches Hymns: But if he pleases to inform us what
 that *Figure* is which in the same place makes the
Cross to signify *Christ*, in which it distinguishes
Christ from the *Cross*; and who those *Poets* are to
 whom this *Figure* is sufficiently known, he will ob-
 lige us. For that this is the case in very many of
 those *Hymns*, is apparent: I shall instance only in
One, and that so noted, that St. * *Thomas*, * 3. p. q. 25. art. 4. p. 53.
 unacquainted it seems, as well as we, with thus argues: Illi exhibemus
 this *Figure*, concluded the *Adoration of the* *Latvia cultum*, in quo poni-
Cross, to be the sense of their *Church* mus spem salutis, sed in Cruce
 from it. "|| *The Banner of our King ap-* *Christi ponimus spem salutis,*
pears, The Mystery of the Cross shines, *Cantat enim Ecclesia, O Crux*
 "Upon which the Maker of our *Flesh* was || *Vexilla Regis prodeunt,*
 "hanged in the *Flesh*. Beautiful and *Fulget Crucis mysterium,*
 "bright Tree! Adorn'd with the Purple of a *Quo carne carnis Conditor*
 "King, Chosen of a Stock worthy to touch *Suspensus est patibulo.*
 "such Holy Members: Blessed, upon whose *Arbor decora & fulgida,*
 "Arms, The Price of the World hung. Hail, *Ornata Regis purpura,*
 "O *Cross*, our only Hope! In this time of *Electa digno stipite,*
 "the *Passion*, Encrease the Righteousness of *Tam Sancta membra tangere.*
 "the Just, and give Pardon to the Guilty. *Beata cujus brachiiis*
 Now by what *Figure* to make the *Banner* *Socli pendit pretium.*
 and the *King* the same; the *Cross* upon *Statera sacra Corporis,*
 which the maker of our *Flesh* hung, not dif- *Prædamq; tulit Tartari.*
 ferent from that *Flesh* that hung upon it; *O Crux Ave spes unica!*
 the *Tree* chosen of a Stock worthy to touch *Hoc passionis tempore,*
Christ's *Auge piis Justitiam,*
Reisq; dona Veniam.
Vid. Breviar. Rom. Dom.
Passionis. p. 255, 256.

Christ's Sacred Members, the same with *his Sacred Members*; What noted *Figure* this is which is so well known to the *Poets*, and yet has been so long concealed from us, that we are amazed at the very report of such a *Figure*, and believe it next a kin to *Transubstantiation*, the *Vindicator* may please hereafter to inform us.

The English
Translation in
the Office of the
Holy Week, is
this:

O lovely and resplendent Tree, Adorned with purpled Majesty; Cull'd from a worthy Stock, to bear Those Limbs which sanctified were. Blest Tree, whose happy Branches bore The Wealth that did the World restore: Hail Cross of Hopes the most sublime, Now in this mourning Passion Time, Improve Religious Souls in Grace, The Sins of Criminals efface.
Pag. 355, 356.

OF RELIGUES.

|| Con. Tr.
Sess. 25.
Affirmantes
Sanctorum Reli-
quias venera-
tionem atq; ho-
norem non de-
beri, damnan-
dos esse.

In the Point of *Reliques*, the *Council of Trent* proceeded so equivocally, that the *Vindicator* ought not to think it at all strange, if I endeavour'd more plainly to distinguish, what the ambiguity of their *Expressions* had so much confounded. || "They, says
"the *Council*, are to be condemned, who affirm that no
"Veneration or Honour is due to the *Reliques of Saints*.
To this I replied, that *honour* them we do; but that the *Council of Trent* requires more, not only to *honour*, but *worship* them too: so I render their *Venerari*, whether well or ill is now the question.

Thom. 3. p.
q. 25. art. 6.
pag. 54.

Utrum Reli-
quias Sancto-
rum sint A-
DORANDÆ?
Con.

And first I observe, that in the very Point before us, their own St. *Thomas* gives the very same interpretation to the same word. For having proposed the *Question* in these terms, *Whether the Reliques of Saints are to be ADORED?* He concludes it in the terms of the *Council*, "Seeing we *VENERATE*
"the *Saints of God*, we must also *VENERATE*
their *Bodies and Reliques*.

And again, In his second Objection against this Conclusion, he argues against the Adoration of Reliques thus; "It seems very foolish to VENERATE an insensible Thing. To which he replies thus; "We do not ADORE the insensible Thing for it self, &c. From all which it is beyond dispute evident, that by the VENERATION, Thomas understood ADORATION of Reliques.

fibilem VENERARI. Resp. Ad secund. dicend. Quod Corpus illud insensibile non ADORANDUS propter seipsum; sed, &c.

Conclus: Cum Sanctos Dei Venerimus, eorum quoque corpora & Reliquias Venerari oportet.

Sec. Obj. Stultum videtur rem insensibilem

Secondly, That it is the Doctrine of their Church, that RELIQUES are to be ADORED, their greatest Authors render it beyond denial evident. * Vasquez in his Disputations upon Thomas, tell us, It is, says he, "among the [pretended] Catholics, a Truth not to be doubted of, that the RELIQUES of Saints, whether they be any parts of them, as Bones, Flesh, or Ashes; or any other Things that have touched them, or belonged to them, ought to be ADORED. And in conclusion says, That he has proved against Hereticks, that Reliques are to be ADORED: And this too in Answer to the Question proposed in the very terms of the Council, "Whether the Bodies, and other RELIQUES of Saints ought to be VENERATED?"

* Vasquez in 3. p. D. Th. disp. 112.

p. 808. proposita est Questio: An Corpora & alie

Sanctorum Reliquie VENERANDÆ sint?

To this he answers, c. 2.

p. 809. Apud Catholicos veritas indubitata est, Reliquias Sanctorum, siue fuerint

partes ipsorum, ut Ossia, Carnes, & Cineres; siue res alie quæ ipsos tetigerunt, vel ad ipsos pertineant, ADORANDAS & in honoris Sæculo habendas esse. And again, Disp. 113. c. 1. p. 816. Cum ergo jam contra Hereticos constitutum sit, Reliquias esse ADORANDAS, superest explicare quo genere cultus & honoris eas VENERARI debeamus.

Nor is this a Scholastic Tenet, or to be put off with an impropriety of Speech. The Messieurs du Port Royal, are by all allow'd to have been some of the most learned Men of their Church, that this last Age has produced; and too great Criticks in the French Tongue,

|| Response à
un écrit pub-
lié sur les Mi-
racles de la
Sainte Espine.
Pag. 15, 18,
—22, &c.
Cited by Mon-
sieur Dailé.

Tongue, to use any Expressions subject to ambiguity, which, that Language so particularly avoids. The word *ADORE* in *French* is much more rarely used to signify in general any *Honour* or *Veneration*, than in the *Latine*; Yet these very Men, in one of their Treatises publish'd by them, || *Of the Miracles of the Holy Thorne*, use this word to express the *Veneration* they thought due to them. Thus speaking of "one of the Religious that was troubled with the Palsie, *She was carry'd, say they, to the Port Royal to ADORE the Holy Thorne.* Of another, *that having ADORED the Holy Thorne, she was relieved of her Infirmary.* They boast of the great multitudes that frequented their Church *to ADORE the Holy Thorne.* And in one of their Prayers which they teach their *Votaries* to say before it, "*We ADORE thy Crown,*" "O Lord.

Vindict. p. 42.

And now I suppose it is from all these Instances sufficiently evident, that I had reason to interpret *Venerari* in the Council, by *Worship* in my Exposition. As for the other thing he charges me with; That referring to the words of the Council I should make it say, "*That these Sacred Monuments are not unprofitably revered, but are to be sought unto for the obtaining of their Help and Assistance:* whereas indeed the Council's meaning is, *to obtain the Help and assistance of the Saints, not the Reliques:* This is not *my Invention*, but his own *Cavil*; And his citation of the words of the Council a Trick to deceive those who understand it only in his Translation. For whereas he renders it, "*So that they who affirm, that no Veneration or Honour is due to the Reliques of Saints, or that those Reliques and other Sacred Monuments are unprofitably honoured by the Faithful; or*" "that

"that they do in vain frequent the Memories of the Saints, to the end they may obtain their Aid (the Aid of the Saints, Eorum) are to be condemned. He has indeed transposed the *Latin*, on purpose to raise a Dust, and deceive his Reader; the true Order being plainly as I before rendred it; * "So that they who shall Affirm, that no Worship or Honour is due to the Reliques of Saints; or that these and the like Sacred Monuments, are unprofitably honoured; and that for the obtaining of their help (the help of these Sacred Monuments, Eorum) the Memories of the Saints are unprofitably frequented, are to be condemned. This is the true sense of the Council; and for the Instances I added for the Explication of it, they are the same by which their own Catechism excites them to this Worship, and every Day's Experience shews how zealously the People follow these Reliques, in order to these Ends.

* Ita ut Affirmantes Sanctorum Reliquis Venerationem atque Honorem non debere, vel eas aliq; sacra Monumenta inutiliter honorari, atq; Eorum opibus impetrandæ Causæ memorias Sanctorum frustra frequentari, omnino dammandos esse.

ARTICLE V.

Of Justification.

HOW far the true Doctrine of Justification was over-run with such Abuses, as I mention'd, at the beginning of the Reformation, he must be very ignorant in the Histories of those Times that needs to be informed. I do not at all wonder that the *Vindicator* denies these things, who knows very well how far the Interest of his Church is concerned in it. But sure I am, a confident denial, which is

H

all

all the proof he brings, will satisfy none but those, who think themselves obliged to receive the *Tradition* of their *Church*, with the same blindness in *Matters of Fact*, that they are required to do it in *Points of Faith*.

As to the present *Article* before us, two things there
 Vindicat. p. 47. are that he doubts I shall be hardly put to prove. One, That it is the *Doctrine* of our *Church* to distinguish between *Justification* and *Sanctification*; tho the 11th and 12th *Articles* of our *Church* do clearly imply it; and our * *Homily of Salvation*, in exprefs words interpret *Justification*, to be the *Forgiveness* of *Sins*. The Other, "That I impose upon them, as if they made their inward Righteousness a part of *Justification*, and so by consequence said, that their *Justification* it self was wrought by their own Good Works.

* Pag. 12. The very beginning of the *Homily*: Because all Men be Sinners and Offenders against God, &c. no Man can by his

own Acts, &c. be justified or made righteous before God: but every Man is constrain'd to seek for another Righteousness or *Justification* to be received at God's Hands, i. e. the Forgiveness of his Sins and Trespases in such Things as he hath offended. Edit. Oxon. 1683.

As to the former part of which *Imposition*, as he calls it, 'tis the very definition of the Council of Trent;
 † Justificatio, non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed & sanctificatio & renovatio interioris hominis. C. Tr. Sess. vi. c. 7. p. 31.
 † Siquis dixerit, homines justificari vel sola imputatione justitiae Christi, vel sola peccatorum remissione exclusâ gratiâ & charitate quæ in cordibus Eorum per Spiritum S. diffundatur, atq; illis inheret; aut etiam gratiam quâ justificamur esse tantum favorem Dei, Anathema sit. Can. 11. Sess. vi.
 "† By *Justification* is to be understood, not only remission of Sins, but Sanctification, and the renewing of the inward Man: Inasmuch that in their 11th Canon they damn all such as dare to deny it: "¶ If any one shall say that Men are justified, either by the alone Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, or only by the remission of Sins, excluding Grace and Charity, which is diffused in our Hearts by the Holy Ghost, and inheres in them, or that the Grace by which we are justified is only the Favour of God; let him be Anathema.

And

And for the other Point, that they esteem their *Justification* to be wrought, not only by *Christ's Merits*, but also by their own *good Works*; The 32 *Can.* of the same *Session*, is a sufficient proof, where an *Anathema* is denounced against him who shall assert,
 “ * the good Works of a justified Person to be so the
 “ Gift of God, that they are not also the Merits of the
 “ same justified Person; or that He being justified by
 “ the good Works which are performed by him through
 “ the Grace of God, and Merits of Jesus Christ, whose
 “ living Member he is, does not truly merit increase of
 “ Grace and Eternal Life.

* Siquis dixerit hominis justificationi bona Opera ita esse Dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificationi Merita; aut ipsum Justificationum bonis Operibus

quæ ab eo per Dei gratiam, & Jesu Christi Meritum, cujus vivum Membrum est, fuerit, non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ, Vitam æternam, & ipsius Vitæ Æternæ, si tamen in gratiâ decesserit, consecutionem, atq; etiam gloriæ Augmentum, Anathema sit.

Now if those words *truly merit*, do signify that our *good Works* do in their own nature merit a *Reward*, then it must be confess'd, that our *Justification* is wrought by them. If they say that they are therefore only *meritorious*, because accompanied with the *infinite Merits of Christ*; What can be more improper than to affirm, that that which in its own nature has nothing of *Merit*, should *truly merit* only because something which has *infinite Merit* goes along with it.

It would certainly be more reasonable in the *Church of Rome*, if they do indeed believe what these Men seem to grant, that *Good Works* are not in themselves *meritorious*, instead of affirming that they do *truly merit Eternal Life*, to confess with us that they have no *Merit* at all in them; but yet through the *infinite Merits* of our *Blessed Redeemer*, shall, according to *God's Promises*, have a most ample *Reward* bestowed on them.

ARTICLE VI.

Of Merits.

Vindicat. p. 48.

IT ought not to be wondred at, if to shew the true Doctrine of the *Church of Rome* as to the Point of *Merits*, I recurr'd, not to the *Niceties* of the *Schools*, but the *Exposition* of their greatest Men; and whose Names were neither less, nor less deservedly celebrated in their Generations, than *Monsieur de Meaux's*, or the *Vindicators* can be now. The *Council of Trent* has spoken so uncertainly in this Point, as plainly shews they either did not know themselves what they would Establish, or were unwilling that others should. Let the *Vindicator* think what he pleases of these *Men*, and their Opinions, we shall still believe them as able *Expositors* of the *Council of Trent*, as any that have ever undertaken it: And whoso shall compare what they say, with what the *Council* has defined, will find it at least as agreeable to it, as any of those *new Inventions* that have been started since.

Concil. Trid.
Sess. vi. Can. 32.

The Doctrine of *Merits*, establish'd by the *Council*, in the *Canon I* but now cited, is clearly this;
 "That the Good Works of a justified Person are not
 "so the Gift of God, that they are not also the Merits
 "of the same Justified Person; That being justified by
 "the Grace of God, and Merits of Jesus Christ, he do's
 "then truly merit both encrease of Grace, and Eternal
 "Life: In a word, the Point of *Merit*, as we now
 consider it, amounts to this, Whether we do truly and
 properly

properly merit by our own *Good Works*? or, Whether whatsoever we receive, be not a Reward that is given us only through *God's Acceptance*, and *promise* in *Christ Jesus*?

This We affirm, they the Other; and whether the Testimonies I produced for the further clearing of their Doctrine do prove it or no, is now to be enquired by us.

1st, || *Maldonate* is Express, and the *Vindicator's* Exception utterly impertinent to us, who dispute not the *Principle*, but *Merit of Good Works*: "It is very clear, says he, that there is in us an inherent, as they call it, and *proper justice of our own*, tho proceeding from the *Grace and Bounty of God*; and that we do as *truly and properly when we do well*, through *God's Grace*, *merit Rewards*, as we do *deserve Punishment when, without this Grace, we do Ill*."

|| *Maldon. in*
Exek. 18. 20.
p. 425. Ex hoc
loco perspicu-
um est ali-
quam esse no-
stram, ut vo-
cant, inheren-
tem propri-
amq; iustiti-
am, quamvis
ex Dei gratiâ,
& largitate

profectam: & nos tam proprie & verè, cum gratiâ Dei benè agentes *præmia mereri*, quàm sine illâ malè *Agentes supplicia meremur*.

2^{dly}, for *Bellarmino*: † The title of his *Chapter*, † *De Justif.*
cited by me, the *Vindicator* says is *something towards* l. 5. c. 17.
the sense I give it: He would more honestly have *Opera bona*
said, is word for word the translation of it: viz. *justorum me-*
"That our *Good Works* do *Merit [Eternal Life]* con- *ritoria esse ex*
"dignly, not only by reason of *God's Covenant* and *condigno, non*
"acceptation, but also by reason of the *Work it self*. *solum ratione*
pacis, sed etiam ratione *Operum*.

* This is his Position: For the explication of it, * *Meritum ex*
he tells us, that a *Merit of Condignity* may be vary'd *Condigno tri-*
three ways. For, 1st, if the *work* to be performed *bis modis va-*
should be very much *less* than the *hire* promised by *riari potest.*
Nam si foret
opus aliquod

sit multò *inferius mercede* ex conventionē promissâ, ut si dominus Vinez conducere Operarios, & non denarium diurnum, sed centum aureos promercede promitteret, esset ejusmodi *meritum ex condigne ratione pacis, non Operis.* P. 1299. l. B.

the

* Opera justorum esse Bona verè & propriè, sed non tam excellentia ut proportionem habeant cum vitâ aternâ. Et idèò acceptari quidem à Deo ad justam & dignam mercedem vitæ aternæ, sed ex pacto & promissione non ex Operis dignitate. p. 1300. l. A

¶ Si Opus sit revera æquale mercedi, vel etiam majus, sed conventio nulla interueniat.

* Opera Bona justorum esse meritoria vitæ aternæ ex condigno ratione Operis, etiam si nulla extaret divina conventio. p. 1299. D.

† Si & Pactum intercedat, & Opus sit verè par Mercedi, ut cum operarii ad vineam conducuntur pro denario diurno, id meritum erit ex Condigno ratione Operis

& ratione pacti: And he explains it thus, p. 1300. l. B. Non quidem quòd sine pacto, vel Acceptatione non habeat Opus bonum proportionem ad Vitam æternam; sed quia non tenetur Deus acceptare ad illam mercedem Opus bonum, quamvis par & æquale Mercedi nisi conventio interueniat. Quam sententiam Conformem esse non dubitamus Concilio Tridentino, &c.

the Agreement; as if the Lord of the Vineyard instead of a Penny, should have promised the Labourers a hundred pound a day for their work: this would be a merit of condignity upon the Account of the Agreement, or Covenant. And this he thinks too little for our Good Works, and condemns Scotus for holding, “ * That the Works of Just Men are truly and properly good, but not so excellent as to bear a proportion so Eternal Life: and therefore that they are indeed accepted of God to a just and worthy Reward of Eternal Life, but only by the Covenant and Promise of God, not for the dignity of the Work it self.

¶ Another sort of Condignity is, When the Work is equal, or perhaps greater than the Reward, but there is no Covenant that the Reward shall be given to it; This is Condignity upon the account of the Work, not the Covenant. And such Cajetan, and Soto, esteemed our Good Works; * Meritorius of Eternal Life upon the account of the Work it self, tho there were no Covenant that they should be accepted. This also he rejects.

† A third sort of Condignity is, If there be both a Covenant, and that the Work be truly equal to the Reward: as when the Labourers were hired for the Vineyard at a Penny a day. And thus it is with our Good Works; not that, without any Covenant, the Good Work does not bear a proportion to the Reward of Eternal Life; but because, without the Covenant, God would not be bound to accept the Good Work, in order to that Reward, tho otherwise even or equal to it.

This

This is so plain an account of their Doctrine of *Merits*, and so clearly given us as the sense of the *Council of Trent*, that I hope the length of it will be excused by every one but the *Vindicator*; who possibly does not desire that the *Council* should be so freely expounded, as *Bellarmino* here has done it.

But *Vasquez* goes yet further: || 1st, He rejects the Opinion of *Bellarmino*, as too little for their Good Works: and then proposes his own in the * three *Conclusions* mentioned by me; to which I must refer the Reader, and leave him to judge, Whether the little Exceptions the *Vindicator* has made, be sufficient to excuse the Doctrine of them. All I have now to observe is, that the third *Conclusion*, which the *Vindicator* complains he could not find, is the very Subject of the Chapter to which I refer him; and which he could not well overlook, having found the Second but in the foregoing: And for the rest, that *Vasquez* to take away all doubt of his Opinion, does largely shew that it is no way contrary to the *Council* of † *Trent*, but rather a true and natural *Exposition* of it.

|| *Vasquez* in 1, 2^{da}. q. 114. d. 214. c. 3. p. 802. Jam verò hæc nostra Ætate non pauci Theologi Professores mediam quandam Viam elegerunt, inter Scoti Opinionem quam primo Caput memoravi-mus, & aliorum sententiam quam nos ut Veram inferius probavi-mus. Dicunt ergo rationem

Meriti perfecti & condigni, quod simpliciter *Meritum* dicitur, duobus compleri, nempe & dignitate Operis, & promissione mercedis: which was *Bellarmino's* Opinion.

* Pag. 802. The first is that of c. 5. p. 804. Bona Opera Justorum, absq; ulli Acceptatione & pacto, ex se habere dignitatem Vitæ Æternæ. This is against *Scotus* and the *Heretics*, whose Doctrine he thus represents: Opera bona necessaria esse ad Vitam Æternam; ita tamen ut Ipsa Justorum Opera non sint digna remuneratione Vitæ Æternæ, nisi Deus benignitate suâ dignaretur illa remunerare. *Scotus's* Opinion he puts down thus, c. 1. p. 800. Opera Justorum ex se spectata, quatenus procedunt ex auxilio gratiæ Dei, & posita Sanctitate Animæ, per quam Spiritus S. in justis habitat, non habere condignitatem & rationem meriti Vitæ Æternæ, sed totam dignitatem, & totam rationem meriti habere petitam ex promissione & pacto Dei. The second *Conclusion*, c. 7. p. 809. is this: Operibus justorum nullum dignitatis Accrementum provenire ex Meritis aut Personâ Christi, quod alias eadem non haberent, si fierent ex eadem gratiâ à solo Deo liberaliter sive Christo collata. The third; which the *Vindicator* pretends he could not find, tho the Title and Subject of the very next, c. 8. p. 811. is; Operibus justorum accessisse quidem divinam promissionem, eam tamen nullo modo pertinere ad rationem Meriti, sed potius advenire Operibus, non tantum jam dignis, sed etiam jam meritorius.

As for the Conclusion, wherein the *Vindicator* endeavours to excuse him, it is this: First he supposes the *Merits* of *Christ* to have obtain'd *Grace* for us, whereby we may be enabled to work out our Salvation; and then this supposed, he affirms, That we have *no more need* of *Christ's Merits* to supply our Defects, but that our own good Works are of themselves sufficient, without any more imputation of his *Rigorousness*. See this at large, q. 114. art. 8. d. 222. c. 3. n. 30, 31. p. 917. † See *disp.* 214. c. 11, 12. p. 819, &c.

ARTICLE VII. §. 1.

Of Satisfaction.

Vindicat. pag.

54, 55.

† *Conc. Trid.*

Sess. 14. cap. 8.

Can. 73.

IF the † *Council of Trent* has express'd it self in such terms, as do plainly ascribe to our Endeavours a true and proper Satisfaction, whatever Monsieur de Meaux or his *Vindicator* expound to the contrary, we are not to be blamed for charging them with it.

'Tis not enough to say, that they believe *Christ* to "have made an intire satisfaction for Sin, and that
"the necessity of that payment which they require us to
"make for our selves, does not arise from any defect in
"that, but from a certain Order which God has esta-
"blished for a salutary Discipline, and to keep us from
"offending. If *Christ* has made an intire satisfaction
for us; I am sure it must be very improper, if not altogether untrue, to say, that We can make any for our selves. If God indeed has establish'd any such Order as they pretend, let them shew it to us in Scripture: Otherwise we shall never believe that God's Justice does at all require it, since for the infinite Merits of a crucified Saviour, that has made an infinite Satisfaction to his Justice, he may as well forgive Temporal as Eternal Punishment.

That

That * Bellarmine has taught, "That it is we who * Lib. 1. de
 "properly satisfy for our own Sins, and that Christ's purg. c. 10.
 "Satisfaction serves only to make ours valid. Had the *et hoc obijciat,*
si applicatur
nobis per no-
stra Opera
Christi satisfac-
tiō, vel sunt
duæ satisfactio-
nēs simul ju-
stæ, una Chri-
sti, altera nostra, vel una tantum. Resp. p. 1899. After two other manners of Explication,
 he adds; Tertius tamen modus videtur probabilior, quod una tantum sit actualis satisfactio,
 idq; nostra. Neq; hinc excluditur Christus, vel satisfactio ejus; nam per ejus satisfactionem
 habemus gratiam unde satisfaciamus; & hoc modo dicitur applicari nobis Christi satisfac-
 tio; non quod Immediate ipsa ejus satisfactio tollat penam temporalem nobis debitam, sed quod
 Mediate eam tollat, quatenus, viz. ab ea gratiam habemus sine qua nihil Valeret nostra sa-
 tisfactio.

That both * He and † Others of their Communion, * As to the
 have taught it as the Doctrine of their Church, That Point of Satisfac-
 we can make a true and proper Satisfaction for Sin, is tion, Bellar-
 beyond denial evident; and it has before been said, mine distin-
 that the Council of Trent approves their Doctrine. guishes be-
 tween a Satisfac-
 tion to Jus-
 tice, and a Sa-

tisfaction to Friendship: And then concludes; Cum homines peccant in Deum, Amicitiam
 simul & Justitiam Violant. As to the former, Non potest homo Deo satisfacere, &c.
 p. 1675. the Question is, De satisfactione quâ Justitiæ restituitur Aequalitas. And because
 he supposes that the Guilt being remitted, and we received into Friendship with God, the
 Eternity is thereby taken from the Pain, the Question amounts to thus much; An satisfacere
 possint homines pro expiando reatu illius Poenæ qui interdum remanet post remissionem
 culpæ? And whether those Works by which it is done; Sine dicenda propriè satisfactoria ita
 ut nos dicamur Verè ac propriè domino satisfacere. Now both these he affirms, and explicates
 the latter from the Council thus, C. 7. de penit. lib. 4. p. 1694. L. C. Per opera illa poenalia
 de quibus hætenus locuti sumus verè ac propriè Domino satisfieri pro reatu poenæ, qui post
 culpam dimissam remanet expiandus. † I shall instance only in Vasquez, in 3. p. d. 2. c. 1.
 p. 11. First he lays down the Opinion of several of the Schoolmen, Alex. d' Alis, Ricardus,
 Ruardus Tapperus, &c. who held, That a mer Man might condignly satisfy for his own Sins.
 This he rejects, because he supposes it cannot be done without God's assisting Grace, to
 which we forfeited all right by Sin: And so it will follow; Nostram satisfactionem pro
 peccato proprio perfectam non esse, ex eo quod fiat non ex propriis sed ex Acceptis, p. 21.
 c. 5. n. 53. But now, Secondly, God's Grace being supposed, he concludes as to Mortal
 Sins, c. 6. p. 22. n. 58. Nos reipsa nunc satisfacere Deo pro nostro Peccato & Offensâ. He tells us,
 that some indeed allow that our Contrition may be called a Satisfaction, tho not a sufficient
 One, n. 59. Nam qui pro compensatione exhibet id quod potest; licet minus sufficiens illud
 sit,

fit, dicitur aliquò modo *satisfacere*. This Reason *Vasquez* dislikes; he is content this *Satisfaction* should be called *Minus sufficiens*; but then only upon the account before mentioned, or its proceeding from the *Grace of God*: So that, Si Contritio praeccederet infusionem *Gratiae* habitualis ex parte Efficientis, non solum satisfaceret pro macula peccati condignè, sed etiam condignè mereretur *Gratiae* habitualis infusionem. And this he *Expounds* as the *Doctrine* of the *Council of Trent*, N. 62, 63, p. 23. As for *Venial Sins*, Disp. 3. c. 3. p. 27. Ita concedimus (*says he*) homini iusto pro suo peccato Veniali condignam & perfectam satisfactionem, ut ea non indigeat favore Dei condonantis peccatum, vel aliquid illius, aut acceptantis satisfactionem, sed talis sit ut ex natura sua deleat maculam & penam peccati Venialis.

Vindicat p. 57. But that *Protestants* ever assigned this, or any other single Point as the cause of our *separating* from their *Communion*; That we ever taught that any thing at all should be given to a Sinner, for saying a bare *Lord have mercy upon me*; much less more than they pretend to give by all the *Plenary Indulgences* of their *Church*; this is so shameful a *Calumny*, that I am confident the *Vindicator* himself never believed it.

For his last Remark, if it deserves any Answer, "That I reflect upon the Bishop of Meaux, for bringing only, we suppose, to establish this *Doctrine*, when yet very often I do no more my self; I have only this to say, that I believe he can hardly find any one Instance wherein that is the only Argument I bring for our *Doctrine*: Not to add, that possibly it would not be very unreasonable to look upon that as sufficient, not to receive their *Innovations*, till they can bring us some better Arguments to prove that we ought to quit our *Supposition*. They who pretend to impose such things as these, are the Persons on whom the *Proof* will lie; 'tis enough for us to reject them, that we cannot find any footsteps of them, either in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*; and have good reason to believe, by the weakness of their Attempts, that there are not any.

ARTICLE VII. §. 2.

Of Indulgences.

FOR Indulgences, the *Vindicator* thinks it sufficient to answer all the Difficulties I proposed, to confess that "*some Abuses have crept in; that there are indeed many Practices in the Church of Rome, different from that of the Primitive Church; but these being neither necessary, nor universally received, he will not quarrel with us about them.*" Vindicator. p. 58.

But are not these *Abuses* still cherish'd in his Church? Does not the *Pope* still dispatch them abroad, and his *Missionaries* preach them now as shamefully almost, as when *Luther* first rose against them? Is it not necessary, nor universally received, to believe that these *Indulgences* satisfy for the temporal Pain of Sin? Do they not put up *Bills* over their Church Doors and *Altars*, almost every Sunday, to vend them on this Account? Is not his *Holiness* still esteem'd the Churches *Treasurer*? And has he not but very lately sent a † *Universal Indulgence* throughout their whole Church? † This Bull is dated August 11. 1683. and it runs thus:

We give and grant, by virtue of the Presents, a Plenary Indulgence, and intire remission of all Sins. And that the Confessors absolve them in the Court of Conscience of all Sins, Excesses, Crimes and Faults, how grievous or enormous soever they have been, and in what fashion soever they were reserved. And for all this,

The Condition proposed is, To visit some one of the Churches appointed by the Ordinary, to fast the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday; to confess their Sins, and receive the Sacrament, and give somewhat to the Poor. And this the A. B. of *Paris* promises the People, in his Instructions for the Jubilee, shall restore them to the same state they were first put into by Baptism. *Instructions pour Gagner le Jubilé*, pag. 11. *Paris*, 1683. par Ordre de Monseigneur l' Archevêque.

When these things are considered, I doubt it will little avail the *Vindicator* to put me in mind of my Promise, "*That whenever the Penances shall be reduced to their Primitive Practice, we shall be ready to give or receive such an Indulgence as Monsieur de Meaux has described, and as those first Ages of the Church allow'd of.*"

Purgatory. §. 3.

Vindicat.
p. 59.

WHAT I have said as to the Design of the Primitive Christians in praying for the Dead, would have deserved either an ingenuous acknowledgment of the truth of it, or some reasonable proof of its falseness or impertinence. We cannot but suspect that he was hard put to it for Arguments, when all the reason he brings us for the belief of *Purgatory*, is built upon the Authority of two Councils, neither of which are very much esteemed by Us; and the eldest of them 1400 Years after *Christ*.

If the *Vindicator* has any thing of moment to offer for it, he shall not fail of a just Consideration. Otherwise 'twill be as foolish as it is false, to pretend to tell the World, "*That we make a Breach in the Church, and condemn Antiquity upon no other grounds, than a bare supposition that it is injurious to the Merits of Jesus Christ; and which has no other Proof than our own Presumption.*"

PART

PART II.

ARTICLE VIII.

Of the Sacraments in General.

AS to the *number* of the *Sacraments*, the *Vindica-* Vindicat. p. 59.
tor confesses that it is not to be found, either
 in *Scripture* or *Antiquity*. He thinks it sufficient
 that the *Scripture* mentions an *Exterious Ceremony*,
 and an *Interior Grace* annexed thereunto. He should
 then have shewn us that all those *seven* which they
 receive, have at least such an *outward Sign* as he Pre-
 tends, and an *inward Grace*, by *Christ's Institution*,
 annex'd to it. And this so much the rather, for that
 no One of his *Church* has yet been able to do it, tho
 the *Council of Trent* damns all those that dare to de-
 ny it.

ARTICLE IX.

Of Baptism.

WE do not complain of the *Church of Rome*, for Vindicat. p. 61.
 not believing that *Infants dying unbaptised* are
certainly Saved: But we must, and do complain of
Monsieur de Meaux, for declaring so positively, what
 we judge to be at least as uncertain as it is uncha-
 ritable, that they *have not any part in Christ*.

If

If I argued for the more favourable side, I confess'd at least that the *Church of England* had determined nothing concerning it; But that I went about to justify a Breach with the *Church of Rome* on this Account, is a Calumny as great, as the little reflection of *Huguenot* or *Puritan*, before was ridiculous.

That he should be astonish'd to hear a *Church of England* Man argue for this Point, shews how little acquainted he ever was with the Writers of it: I shall mention only two, who I believe were never suspected as *Puritanically* inclined, and yet have argued much more strongly than ever I could have done for it: One the venerable and judicious || Mr. *Hooker* in his *Eccles. Polity*. Lib. 5. Sect. 60. The Other the learned *Arch-Bishop Bramhall* in a set Discourse, which he thus concludes, "*This I take to be the Doctrine of the soundest English Divines, and which I believe to be the Truth: Saving always my Canonical Obedience to my Spiritual Mother the Church of England, and in a higher degree to the Catholick Church, when it shall declare it self in a true and free Oecumenical Council. But neither I, nor any Protestants, do believe that the Church of Rome, including all Other Churches of that Patriarchate, or of its Communion, is that Catholick Church.*"

A. Bp Bramhall's Works, Tom. 4. Disc. 5. p. 983.

For the rest, whether his Arguments or mine on this Point are the better, I am but little concerned, tho he be very much. That which seem'd the most to deserve an Answer, he has thought fit wholly to pass by, viz. that several of his own Authors had maintained the same with me; and I presume he will not say were *Puritans* or *Huguenots* for their so doing.

But that the World may see with what rashness these Men talk, I will now be yet more Express; That

That whereas *Mr. de Meaux*, affirms that this deny-
 "al of Salvation to Infants dying unbaptized, was a
 "Truth which never any one before Calvin durst openly
 "call in question, it was so firmly rooted in the minds
 "of all the Faithful. This is so notoriously false,
 that not only the most Learned of their own
 Church as I proved before, but the very * Fathers
 themselves, have many of them declared for this Do-
 ctrine; even *St. * Augustine* himself not excepted,
 till his Dispute with *Pelagius* provoked him to deny
 that, which in his cooler thoughts, he had more rea-
 sonably allow'd before.

M. de Meaux's
Exp. p. 16.

|| First we have
Cassander, libr.
de Baptismo In-
fant. p. 762.
 and he there
 cites of his
 side *Jo. Ger-*
son, Serm. in Nat.
B. Marie, par. 3.
 preached be-
 fore the Coun-

cil of *Constance*, and all the Fathers there assembled, *p. 769. Gabriel Biel* in 4. dist. 4. q. 2.
Cajetan in 3. p. D. Th. q. 68. art. 1, 2, 3. *Tilmannus Segbergerianus* de 7 Sacram. c. 1. art. 3.
 * *Grot. Via ad pacem*, p. 290. in art. 9. Consult. *Cassander. adds to these*, Inter Veteres,
 Scriptorem quæstionum ad Antiochum quæ *Athanasio* tribuuntur; *Nazianzenum* de S. Bap-
 tismate, duobus locis; & *Scholiassem* ejus *Nicetam*: *sed & ipsum *Augustinum* antequam
 certamine cum *Pelagio* incalefceret, l. 3. de lib. arb. c. 23. locum *Joan. 3.* intelligendum de
 iis qui possunt & contemnunt baptizari, asserit *Lombard. l. 4. dist. 4.*

ARTICLE X.

Of Confirmation.

IN the Article of Confirmation, I affirm'd that se-
 veral of their own Party had deny'd the Divine
 Institution of this pretended Sacrament; and that
 neither the Council of Trent, or their Catechism, had
 offered any thing to prove it.

Vindicat. p. 63.

The *Vindicator* replies, "That my Confession
 "that the Apostles used Imposition of Hands, and that
 "when our Bishops after their Examples do the like, and
 "pray for the Blessing of the Holy Spirit upon us, we
 "piously hope that their Prayers are heard; is a suffici-

"ent

"ent proof of an outward Visible Sign, of an inward
"and Spiritual Grace.

Had I indeed affirm'd that the *Apostles* had instituted this *Imposition of Hands*, to be continu'd in the *Church*, and promised that the *Grace of the Holy Ghost* should certainly descend at their doing of it, for all those great Ends our Prayers design; this might have made *Confirmation* look somewhat like a *Sacrament* to Us. But to argue from a meer indifferent *Ceremony*, continued only in imitation of the *Apostles*, and to which no blessing is ascribed that may not equally be allow'd to any Other the like Prayer; and then cry out that this must needs argue the *Divine Institution* of it, *because none but God can promise Grace to an outward Sign*, this is in effect to confess that there is nothing at all to be said for it.

It is wonderful to see with what confidence those of the *Church of Rome*, urge the *Apostles Imposition of Hands* for proof of *Confirmation*, as it is now practised amongst them; in which there is not any the least resemblance. Our Bishops lay on Hands after their Example: But for theirs, "they anoint, make
"Crosses in the Forehead, tie a Fillet about their Heads,
"give them a box on the Ear, &c. for which there is neither *Promise*, *Precept*, nor *Example* of the *Apostles*: but for *Imposition of Hands*, the only thing they did, this they have resolved to be but an || *Accidental Ceremony*, and accordingly have in their * practice wholly laid it by.

|| So *Estius* in
4. Sent. dist. 7.

S. 7. p. 81.

* So the same

Estius proves
from the

Council of *Florence*; In quo, *says he*, legitur quod loco illius. manus impositionis per quam Apostoli dabant Spiritum S. in Ecclesia datur Confirmatio, cujus materia est Christma. Ex quibus verbis utrumq; colligitur, & initio necessariam fuisse manuum impositionem Sacramenti necessitate, & eandem ipsius necessitatem, signaculo Christmatis introducta, cessasse.

ARTICLE XI.

Of Penance.

That *Penance* is not *truly* and *properly* a *Sacrament*, Vindicat. p. 64.
 nor was ever esteemed so by the Primitive Church, I at large proved in my *Exposition* of it : and the *Vindicator* has not in his Reply advanced any one thing to answer the Objections that were brought against it.

He allows *Publick Confession* to have been a part Ibid. p. 64.
 of *Discipline* only, and alterable at pleasure; but then affirms that either *Publick* or *Private* was always *necessary*; and this we are to take of him upon his own word.

In short, he repeats the Sum of their Doctrine to us; Ibid. p. 67.
 and then, as if he had done his Business, "*This*, says he, "*we have always held and practised, and this we affirm*
 "*to be conformable to the practice of the most Antient*
 "*and Orthodox Churches*; and adds, that He is *astomish'd* at our rejection of it. All which Stuff is easily said, and may with the same ease and reasonableness be deny'd.

And therefore to conclude this in a word; If ever he gets so well out of his *Astonishment*, as to come to his Reason again, and will then undertake to prove *Penance* to be *truly* and *properly* a *Sacrament*, *instituted by Christ*, and *necessary to Salvation*, either in *Act* or *Desire*, he shall not fail of an ingenuous Reply to his Arguments. In the mean time, I have before shewn, that we do practise it, as far as is either necessary or

convenient ; and farther than this we shall not think our selves bound to go, till we are somewhat better convinced of our Obligations to it, than the *Vindicator* has hitherto been willing or able to do.

ARTICLE XII.

Of Extreme Unction.

Vindicat. p. 68. IN explaining the words of St. James brought for this *pretended Sacrament*, I follow'd the Interpretation which both the practice of the *Primitive Church* naturally leads to ; and which *Cardinal Cajetan* confesses, and their own publick *Liturgies* shew, was for above 800 Years esteem'd the undoubted meaning of them.

The *Vindicator*, from *Bellarmino*, advances many Things, as he supposes, contrary to this *Exposition* ; but the greatest part of which are utterly false, the rest impertinent.

“ The Grace of curing the Sick, he says, was not given to all Priests and Elders alike, but only to some select Persons. If this be true, it was then best like St. James's Intention, that they should send for those Priests to whom it was given. And however some Others might have this Grace, yet certainly it was principally at least given to the Priests and Elders, for the honour and benefit of their Ministry.

“ These did not only cure the Sick, but the Lame and the Blind. And therefore he would, I suppose, have had St. James taken notice of these two. He might

might have added the *Dead* likewise; for *those who healed the Lame and the Blind, raised the Dead also.* * *Adavei* answers to the Hebrew *אָדָוַי* and signifies all sorts of Infirmities: and *אָדָוַי רַבִּי מוֹשֶׁה*, is no unheard of phrase for being *Lame*.

"*Their Power of Miracles was not tied to Unction only*: But yet since we find in *St. Mark* that this was the ordinary Sign, what wonder if *St. James* describe it by that which was the most common and frequent amongst them? Mark 6. 13.

"*All those that were anointed, were not cured.* This is false, and cannot be maintain'd without dishonour to that Spirit by which they acted: "*Neither had all they that were cured by them who had the Gift of Healing, any assurance by that Cure of the Forgiveness of their Sins.* This again is false: The Sin here promised to be forgiven, is that for which the Sickness was sent, if it was sent for any: Now *St. James* expressly promises, that in this case, whenever the Health of the Body was restored, this Sin should be forgiven too; and therefore it must be false to say it was not. Vindicat. p. 69.

He adds, lastly, "*That St. James promises, that the Prayer of Faith shall save the Sick, and the Lord shall raise him up: Which if it had been meant of bodily Health, those only would have died in the Apostle's Time, who either neglected this Advice, or whose Deaths prevented the accomplishment of this Ceremony.* And if it must be understood of the Soul's

Health, then it will follow that none were *damned*, either then or now, but what neglect this *Advice*, or whose *Deaths* prevent the accomplishment of this *Ceremony*; concerning the Truth of which the *Vindicator* may please to give us his Opinion.

But the Vanity of this Objection proceeds from the want of a true Notion of the Nature of these *Gifts*. They who had the greatest measure of them, could not yet exercise them when they would. The same *Spirit* that helped them to perform the Miracle, instructed them also when they should do it. So that they never attempted it, but when they saw the sick Person had *Faith* to be *healed*, and that it would be for the greater Glory of God to do it. St. Paul had doubtless this *Gift of Healing*; and yet
 1 Tim. 5. 22. he neither cured *Timothy* of the *weakness of his Stomach*, and his other frequent *Infirmities*; and left
 2 Tim. 4. 20. *Trophimus* at *Miletum* sick. That this *Gift of Healing* was in the Church at this time, is not to be doubted, though this place should not belong to it. Will the *Vindicator* argue against this, that then none died till it went out of the Church, but such as refused the benefit of it, or died suddenly before they had time to do it?

It may appear by this, how little they have to object against the true Design and Interpretation of this passage: For Cardinal Cajetan's Authority, the *Vindicator* tells us, That "*had I said only, that he thought it could not be proved, neither from the Words, nor the Effect, that St. James speaks of the Sacramental Unction of Extreme Unction; but rather*
 Vindicat. p. 69,
 ——— 70. *Nec ex verbis, nec ex effectu, verba hæc loquuntur de Sacramentali Unctione Extremæ Unctionis: sed magis de Unctione quam instituit Dominus Jesus, à Discipulis exercendam in ægrotis.* Cajet. Annot. in Loc.

"of that Unction which our Lord Jesus instituted in
 "the Gospel to be exercised by his Disciples upon the Sick,
 "I had been a faithful Quoter of his Sense: But to tell
 "us he freely confesses it can belong to no other, is to im-
 "pose upon him and the Readers. As if when two
 Things only are in controversy for the Cardinal, ab-
 solutely to exclude the one, and apply it to the o-
 ther, were not in effect (for I design'd not to tran-
 slate his words) to confess, that it could belong only
 to that.

But that which is most considerable is, that the
 Antient *Liturgies* of the Church, and the publick
 practice of it, for above 800 Years, shew, that they
 esteemed this Unction to belong primarily to *bodily*
Cures, and but secondarily only to the *sickness* of the
Soul. And because these *Rituals* are not in every
 bodies hands, to argue at once the truth of my Af-
 fertion, and shew how little conversant the *Vindica-*
tor has been in them, I will here insert some particu-
 lar proofs of it.

Upon the *Thursday in the Holy Week*, when this
Oil was wont to be consecrated, they did it with this
Prayer:

Ex S. Gregorii Libr. Sacram. p. 66.

' Fer. 5. post Palm. E-
 ' mitte domine Spiritum
 ' S. tuum paraclitum de
 ' Cœlis in hanc pinguedi-
 ' dem Olivæ, quem de Vi-
 ' ridi ligno producere dig-
 ' natus es; ad refectiorem
 ' Corporis; ut tuâ sanctâ
 bene-

' That by this Blessing
 ' it might become the
 ' Defence both of the
 ' Mind and Body; to cure
 ' all Pains and Infirmities,
 ' and sickness of the Body:
 nothing else mentioned.

The same is
 in effect the
 Prayer of the
 Greek Church:
 "αγε ωιδου
 τοις χειρι-
 ναις αυτου (ελα-
 107) εις δια-
 ταια παθος
 παντος, υμου
 (καταρτισις, &
 108)

In

μo-

μολυσμῶν Cas-
 κῆς καὶ πνεύμα-
 τος. Euch.
 p. 263.
 Nor is it much
 different in
 that publish'd
 by *Thomasius*, as *P. Gelasius's* Ritual, before *P. Gregories*, upon the same day, p. 69. only
 that he generally joins *Mentis & Corporis*.

In the Office of *Visiting the Sick*, several Introductory Prayers, all for the Bodies Recovery, are first said : such as this, pag. 251, &c.

Ad visitand. infirm. p. 251.
 'Deus qui famulo tuo He-
 'zekia ter quinos Annos
 'ad vitam donâsti, ita &
 'famulum tuum N. à le-
 'cto ægritudinis tua po-
 'tentia erigat ad salutem.
 'Per.
 O God, who didst add
 'to the Life of thy Ser-
 'vant Hezekiah fifteen
 'Years, let thy Power in
 'like manner raise up this
 'thy Servant from his Bed
 'of Sicknefs. Through
 '&c.

Some of these being said, the Priest goes on thus :

S. James 5.
 14, 15.
 'Domine Deus, qui per
 'Apostolum locutus es,
 'Infirmatur quis in Vobis,
 'inducat Presbyteros Ec-
 'clesiæ & orent super eum
 'ungentes eum oleo Sancto
 'in Nomine Domini, &c.
 'Cura quæsumus Re-
 'demptor noster gratiâ
 'Spiritus Sancti languores
 'istius Infirmi : & sua sa-
 'na vulnera, ejusq; dimitte
 'O Lord God, who by
 'thy Apostle hast said, If
 'any Man be sick, let him
 'call for the Elders of the
 'Church, and let them
 'pray over him, anointing
 'him with Oil in the Name
 'of the Lord, &c: Cure
 'we beseech thee, O our
 'Redeemer, by the
 'Grace of the Holy Spirit,
 'the sicknefs of this infirm
 Person :

'te peccata, atq; dolores
'cunctos cordis & corpo-
'ris expelle, plenamq; &
'interius exteriùsq; sa-
'nitatem miserecorditer
'redde: ut ope misere-
'cordiæ tuæ *restitutus* &
'*Sanatus*, ad pristina Pie-
'tatis tuæ reparetur Of-
'ficia ; Per &c.

'*Person: Heal his Wounds,*
'*and forgive his Sins, and*
'*expel all the Pains, both*
'*of his Heart, and of his*
'*Body; and restore him*
'*mercifully to full health,*
'*both inward and out-*
'*ward: that being by thy*
'*merciful Aid Recovered*
'*and Healed, he may be*
'*strengthened to the for-*
'*mer Duties of thy Ser-*
'*vice; Through &c.*

Then the *sick Person* kneels down upon the right
Hand of the *Priest*, and this *Antiphona* is sung :

' Dominus locutus est
' Discipulis suis, *In No-*
' mine meo *Demonia eji-*
' cite, & *super Infirmos*
' manus vestras imponite &
' bene habebunt. Psalm.
' Deus Deorum Dominus
' locutus est : Et repetit,
' *In Nomine meo* &c.

' The Lord said unto
' his Disciples, *In my*
' Name cast out Devils ;
' and lay your hands upon
' the Sick and they shall
' Recover. Then the 49
' Psalm, *The Lord, the*
' *Mighty God, hath spo-*
' *ken, &c.* After which
' they repeat again: *In*
' *my Name* &c. as before.

Then follows this *Prayer*.

' Oremus Dominum
' nostrum *Jesum Chri-*
' *stum*, & cum omni sup-
plica-

' Let us pray unto our
' Lord *Jesus Christ*, and
' beseech him with all
supplica-

Of Extreme Unction.

'plicatione rogemus, ut	'supplication, that he
'hunc famulum suum N.	'would vouchsafe, by his
'per Angelum Sanctum	'Holy Angel, <i>to visit, make</i>
'suum visitare, latificare,	'glad, and comfort this his
'& confortare dignetur.	'Servant.

Afterwards this *Antiphona*.

'Succurre Domine In-	'Succour, O Lord,
'firmo isti N. & Medica	'this <i>Infirm Person</i> N.
'eum spiritali Medica-	'and heal Him with a spi-
'mine, ut in <i>pristinâ sa-</i>	'ritual Medicine, that
'nitate restitutus, gratia-	'being restored to his for-
'rum tibi sanus referat	'mer Health, when he is
'Actiones.	'Well, he may return
	'thanks unto thee.

Then follows another *Psal*m, and after it this *Antiphona* :

'Sana Domine <i>infirmum</i>	'Heal, O Lord, this <i>sick</i>
'istum cujus Ossa	'Person whose Bones are
'turbata sunt, & cujus A-	'troubled, and whose
'nima turbata est Valde :	'Soul is very much affli-
'sed tu Domine conver-	'cted : but turn thou, O
'tere, & sana eum, &	'Lord, and heal him, and
'eripe animam ejus.	'deliver his Soul.

After

After this is said the 6th Psalm, from whence the *Antiphona* was taken; which being ended, they anoint the sick Person in several parts, but especially in that where the pain lies; saying this Prayer:

‘*Inungo te de Oleo sano in Nomine Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti: ut non lateat in Te Spiritus immundus, neque in membris, neque in medullis, neque in compagine membrorum; sed in te habitet virtus Christi Altissimi & Spiritus Sancti; quatenus per hujus Operationem Mysterii, atque per hanc Sacramenti Olei Unctionem, atque nostram deprecationem, virtute Sanctæ Trinitatis medicatus sive fatus, pristinam & immelioratam recipere merearis sanitatem: Per eundem.*

‘I anoint thee with this Holy Oil, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; that no unclean Spirit may remain in thee, but that the virtue of the most highest of Christ, and the Holy Ghost may dwell in thee: to the End that by the Operation of this Mysterie, and through the Unction of this holy Oil, and our Prayers, thou may’st be healed and restored by the Vertue of the Holy Trinity, and receive thy former and better health, Through the same.

Instead of this, Arcudius gives us this Form out of a very ancient Manuscript in the Greek Church: Πάτερ ἄγιε. ἱατρὲς ψυχῶν καὶ σώματων — σώματος καὶ τῶν δυνάμεων ἐν τῷ σώματι. Ὁ ἅγιος Πνεῦμα διώκων αὐτὸν σαρκικῆς καὶ σαρκικῆς ἀδυναμίας — καὶ ζωοποιῶν αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, &c. And in another Office; Χεῖρ τοῦ ἁγίου Πατρὸς, καὶ υἱοῦ, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, ὁ ἁγίος πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἀναστήσει.

And the Prayers in the Office of the Eucelaion are all exactly conformable, to what I have here observed.

L

Then

Then follows this Prayer.

‘Domine Deus Salva-
tor noster, qui es vera
salus & Medicina, à quo
omnis Sanitas & Medi-
camentum venit, quiq;
nos Apostoli documento
instruis ut *languentes O-*
lei liquore Orantes tan-
geremus, respice propi-
tius super hunc famu-
lum tuum N. & quem
languor curvat ad exitum,
& virium defectus
trahit ad Occasum, me-
dela tuæ gratiæ restituat
in Salutem. Sana quoq;
quæsumus omnium me-
dicator ejus februm, &
cunctorum languorum
Cruciatu, ægritudinem-
que, & dolorum omni-
um dissolve tormenta,
viscerumq; ac cordium
interna Medica: Me-
dullorum quoq; & Co-
gitationum: *Sana* dis-
crimina ulcerum, vani-
tatumq; putredines e-
vacua, Conscientiarumq; atq; plagarum obducito
cicatrices veteres, immensâq; remove passiones:
Carnis ac Sanguinis materiam reforma, delictorumq;

‘O Lord God our Sa-
viour, who art the true
Health and *Medicine*,
and from whom all
Health and Medicine doth
proceed: who also, by
the *Instruction* of thy
Holy Apostle hast taught
us, that we should anoint
the Sick with Oil, look
down we beseech thee
in mercy upon this thy
Servant N: and whom
his *weakness* has brought
down to *Death*, and the
decay of his *strength*
draws towards his *End*,
Let the power of thy
Grace restore to *Health*:
Heal, we beseech thee,
his *Favours*, &c. —
And let the *Holy Unction*
of this *Oil* be the *Expul-*
sion of his present *Sick-*
ness and *Infirmity*, and
the remission of all his
Sins: Through.

cuncto-

‘cunctorum veniam tribue; sicq; illum tua pietas
 ‘jugiter custodiat, ut nec ad Correptionem aliquando
 ‘*Sanitas*, nec ad perditionem nunc, Te auxiliante,
 ‘perducat Infirmitas; sed fiat illi hæc *Olei Sacri per-*
 ‘*unctio*, morbi & languoris *presentis* expulsio, atq; pecca-
 ‘*torum omnium optata remissio*: Per Dominum nostrum.

Then let the Priest give him the *Communion* of the
 Body and Blood of *Christ*: and if occasion be,
 let them repeat this seven days; “*And the Lord*
 “*shall raise him up*; and *I F he be in Sins, they*
 “*shall be remitted*.

The Priest ought also to say the *Morning and Even-*
ing Service every day to the Sick Person, adding
 the *Hymn*; || “*Christe Cælestis Medicina Patris*; || See the
 which is a *Prayer* entirely for the recovery of *Hymn, Cassander*
 the *Bodily Health*. *Oper. p. 287.*

This was the method of their *Unction* in Pope
 Gregory’s *Missal*; and which I suppose shews that it
 had somewhat more than a bare respect to *bodily Cures*;
 indeed was, as I before affirm’d, especially designed
 for them. It were an easy matter to shew the very
 same to be the practice of the *Greek Church* at this
 Day; insomuch that * *Arcudius* himself could not * *Arcud. de Sa-*
 dissemble it: But I shall close this with one Obser-
 vation more which † *Cassander* has given us, that it *cram. Ester.*
 was anciently the custom to anoint, not only the *Unct. l. 5. c. 5.*
elder Persons, but even *Infants*, after the same man-
 ner; not sure for the forgiveness of those remains of *de formâ hu-*
Sin which the former *Sacraments* had not sufficiently *jus Sacramen-*
cleared, but for the same End for which they then did *ti.*
 all others, the *Recovery of their bodily Health*. † *Cassander.*
Oper. p. 289. where he alio
 cites *Cusanus*
 for the same
 Remark.

ARTICLE XIII.

Of Marriage.

Vindicator. p. 70. **T**hat Marriage is not a *Sacrament truly and properly* so called, as the *Council of Trent* has defined it, their own Authors sufficiently shew. || *Lombard* denies that there is any *Grace* conferr'd in it, and affirms it as a † *Sacrament*, to have been instituted not only before *Christ*, but even before the *Fall*; and therefore was not cited, either for *Ostentation*, or for the silly Reason mention'd by the *Vindicator*.

eo gratiam conferri, sed longè post eum *Durandus* disertè inquit, non esse Matrimonium univocè Sacramentum sicut alia Sacramenta novæ legis, nam nec conferre gratiam non habenti, nec augere habenti; non esse itaq; Sacramentum propriè ac strictè dictum. † *Lib. 4. d. 2. l. C. p. 696.* Fuit tamen Conjugium ante Peccatum institutum, non utiq; propter Remedium, sed ad Sacramentum. Et d. 26. l. A. Cum alia Sacramenta post peccatum & propter peccatum exordium sumpsint, Matrimonii Sacramentum etiam ante peccatum legitur institutum à Domino.

* 4 *Sent. d. 26.* * *Durandus* in express terms declares, that forasmuch as it neither confers *Grace* where it is not, nor encreases it where it is, it cannot be a *Sacrament truly and properly so called*.

It is therefore evidently false to say, that *Lombard* is against me in this Matter; and for the torrent of *Fathers and † Scriptures* which he talks of, it would have been more to this purpose to have produced their Authorities, than thus vainly to boast of that which we certainly know he is not able to perform.

† For his torrent of *Fathers*, *Ballamint* has been able to collect but six or seven, of

which not one to the purpose, nor any very ancient: And for the *Scriptures*, *Estius* one of the wisest of their own Party, is forced to confess; Cum igitur hujus Doctrina non possit ex Scripturis haberi probatio, saltem aperta & evidens; consequens est articulum hunc, Matrimonii Sacramento gratiam conferri, unum esse ex traditionibus Ecclesiæ non Scriptis, & ad Verbum Dei non scriptum sed traditum pertinere. 4 *Sent. d. 26. §. 7. p. 61.*

ARTI-

ARTICLE XIV.

OF *Holy Orders.*

IF the *Vindicator* be truly agreed with Me in this *Vindicat. p. 71.*
Article, He must then renounce the number of his
seven Sacraments. I deny'd that there was any *Sign*
instituted by Christ, to which his Grace is annexed: All
 the Authority *Imposition of Hands* has in Scripture,
 being only the Example of three or four places,
 where it was practis'd indeed, but no where com-
 manded. I affirm'd that several of his own *Church*
 had declared it not to be *Essential to Holy Orders*, nor
 by consequence *the outward Sign of a Sacrament in*
them. In a word, I said, that the *Grace* conferr'd
 was no *Justifying Grace*, nor by consequence such as
 is requisite to make a *true and proper Sacrament:*
 To all which he has thought fit not to offer one word
 in Answer.

ARTI-

ARTICLE 15, 16, 17, 18.

Of the Eucharist.

Vindicar. p. 72.

AS to the Business of the *Eucharist*, I had not entred on any Argument about it, had not *Monsieur de Meaux* here thought fit to lay aside the Character of an *Expositor*, to assume that of a *Disputant*.

For the words of *Institution*, which are the principal part of this Controversy, I proposed two Arguments to confirm the Interpretation which our Church gives of them: One from the the natural import of the words themselves; the Other from the intention of our Saviour in the institution of this Holy Sacrament. To the former of these the *Vindicator* thought he could answer somewhat; but for the latter, it has been urged chiefly since *Bellarmino's* time, and so our Author had nothing to say to it.

Ibid.

Pag. 73, 74.

For the former then he tells us, first, Of the *insincerity of my Attacque*; That the Bishop declared there *“was nothing in the words of Institution OBLIG-
“ING them to take them in a figurative sense; to
“which I oppose only, That there are such Grounds in
“them for a figurative Interpretation, as NATU-
“RALLY lead to it.”* Tis true, I have not here used the very word OBLIGED, but yet in my proof I proceed upon such Grounds as I said would *NECESSARILY REQUIRE* a *figurative*
Inter-

Expos. Ch. of
Eng. P. 47.

Interpretation; which is much the same thing. And though I cannot tell what will Oblige Him to take those words in their true, *i. e.* figurative sense; yet if I have proved, "*That there are such Grounds in those words as Naturally*, indeed necessarily lead to it; any reasonable Man would think, that joyn'd with the Other proof *from the Reason of the thing it self*, might be sufficient to Oblige him to acquiesce in it.

But we will examine his Process, which whether it argues more my *unsincerity*, or the falseness of their Interpretation, I shall leave it to the Reader to judg.

First; He confesses, as to my first Position, that *Vindicat. p. 73.* the words themselves do *naturally* lead to a *figurative* Interpretation. "No Body, *says he*, ever deny'd "but the words as they lie (without considering the "Circumstances and Practice of the Church, deliver- "ing the Interpretation of them down to us) *might* "possibly lead to a *figurative* Interpretation: Seeing the "like Expressions are frequently found in Scripture: "As for Example, *I am a Door, I am a Vine, &c.* "Which being always taken by the Church in a *figu- "rative sense*, we should esteem him a Mad-man that "should think it possible after this, to perswade all "the World they ought to be taken in a *literal*. "And as it would be a madness to suppose all Man- "kind might in future Ages be so sottish, as to re- "nounce this *figurative* Interpretation of *Jesus* "Christ's being a *Dore*, and a *Vine*, and fall so far "into the *literal sense*, as to believe him to be *sub- "stantially* present in them, and pay the utmost ado- "rations

¶ This is the Pretence of Mr. Arnauld, and at large refuted by Mr. Claude in his answer to him; whose Works being in English, I shall refer the Reader, who desires to see the vanity of this Argument exposed, to what he has there said.

"rations to him there, set them up in Temples to be Adored, and celebrate Feasts in honour of them; ¶ So we cannot but think it to be irrational to imagine, that if the Disciples and whole Church in all Nations, had been once taught these words, *"This is my Body*, were to be taken in a figurative sense, it could ever have happen'd that the Visible Church in all Nations, should agree to teach their Children the *literal*, &c.

The meaning of which Discourse, if I understand it aright, is this Concession, that the words of *Institution* do in themselves as naturally lead to a figurative Interpretation, as those other Expressions, *I am a Vine, I am a Door*: And the only thing which makes the difference is, that the Church, as he supposes, has from the beginning interpreted the One according to the Letter, the Other in a figurative Acceptation.

"Secondly, As to my Argument, That if the Relative *This*, in that Proposition, *this is my Body*, refer'd to the Bread which our Saviour held in his Hand, the natural repugnancy there is betwixt the two things affirmed of one another, *Bread* and *Christ's Body* will NECESSARILY REQUIRE the figurative Interpretation. This * Bellarmine, † Gratian, and others do confess, and the Vindicator himself seems contented with it; Only he

† Hoc est impossibile quod Panis sit Corpus Christi: de Consecrat. d. 2. c. 55. p. 2393. in Gloss.

* De Euch. l. 1. c. 1. p. 462. l. D. speaking of Carolus Brad's Opinion of the Eucharist; Scripsit, says he, Verba Evangelistæ, Hoc est Corpus meum, hunc facere sensum, Hic Panis est Corpus meum, quæ sententia aut accipi debet tropicè, ut Panis sit Corpus Christi significativè, aut est planè absurda & Impossibilis, nec enim fieri potest, ut Panis sit Corpus Christi. Ex l. 3. c. 19. p. 747. Non potest fieri ut vera sit propositio in qua Subjectum supponit pro Panis, predicatum autem pro Corpore Christi, &c.

believes

believes, That all my Logic will never be able to prove that the Pronoun *THIS* must necessarily relate to (Panis)

* Bread, and not to (Corpus) Body. How far my Logic has been able to do this, I must leave it to others to determine; but for the *Vindicator's* satisfaction, I do assure him, that *Bellarmino* looks upon it to be Good Logic. And because it is in the middle of the citation I referred to, and which he has almost entirely transcribed, excepting only the part I am now speaking of, I will not charge him with *unsincerity* in the omission, but I must needs say 'twas indiscreet to put the issue of the Question upon what his Cardinal

had so freely confessed: † "The Lord, says he, took † *Bellarmino* de Euchar. l. 3. c. 19. p. 746. "Bread in his hands, and blessed it, and gave it to his Disciples, and said of it, This is my Body: Therefore he took BREAD, and blessed BREAD, and gave BREAD to his Disciples, and said of BREAD, This is my Body. And in another place, arguing against this very Opinion of the *Vindicator*, That *THIS* in that proposition belongs to *BODY*, not the *BREAD* which he held in his hand; says, "That if a Man points with his finger to a thing whilst he utters a pronoun demonstrative, 'twere absurd to say that any thing else should be referred to, but that thing. Our Lord took Bread, and reaching it out to them, said, Take, Eat, *THIS* is my Body; He seems to have pointed to the *BREAD*; and therefore must have shewn some certain thing, even before the other words were pronounced.

* In the *Ethiopian Church* they give the Holy Eucharist with this Explication, *Hic Panis est Corpus meum.* *Ludolphi Hist.* l. 3. c. 5. n. 56.

stendat, dum Pronomen effert, valde absurdum videtur dicere Pronomine illo non demonstrari rem presentem. Atqui Dominus accepit *Panem*, & illum porrigens ait, *Hoc est Corpus meum*; videtur igitur demonstrasse *Panem*. Neque obstat quod propositio non significat nisi in fine totius prolationis. Nam etsi ita est de propositione quæ est Oratio quedam, tamen demonstrativa pronomina mox indicant certum aliquid, etiam antequam sequantur ceteræ voces. Et sane in illis verbis, *Bibite ex hoc omnes*, valde durum est non demonstrari, I D. quod Erat, sed I D. tantum quod futurum erat.

M

From

From which put together, I think we may frame this Argument:

If the Relative *THIS*, in that Proposition, *This is my Body*, belong to the *Bread*, so that the meaning is, *This Bread is my Body*, then it must be understood *Figuratively*, or 'tis plainly *absurd and impossible*:

But the relative *This* in that proposition, *This is my Body*, does belong to the *Bread*, forasmuch as Christ took *Bread*, and blessed *Bread*, and gave *Bread* to his Disciples, and therefore said of *Bread*, *This is my Body*: Therefore

That proposition, *This is my Body*, must be understood *figuratively*, or 'tis plainly *absurd and impossible*.

How far the *Vindicator* will approve this *Logick*, I cannot tell; but the first *proposition* is their common concession, and he himself seems contented with it. The second is *Bellarmino's* own grant, nay what he contends for, and indeed what the connexion of the Words do evidently require: And then for the *conclusion*, I believe a very little *Logick* will be enough at any time to make good the sequel of it.

Vind. p. 75.

But the *Vindicator* has an Exception against all this, and tells us, "*That it will all argue nothing against them, unless I beg the Question, and suppose that no real change was made by those words.* I presume it is as much a *begging of the Question* for him to suppose there was, as for me that there was not. We do not now enquire how to expound the *Proposition*, supposing there were such a change made as they imagine; but the Question is, *Whether these Words do necessarily imply any such change*, nay, rather do not oblige us to take them in a *figurative sense* to shew that there is none?

How-

However he is resolved he will *suppose* the Question first, and then prove it, tho' I must not. "*We will suppose*, says he, *and that not incongruously, That our Blessed Saviour in changing the Water into Wine, might have made use of these words THIS IS WINE, or LET THIS BE WINE.* I hope he does not look upon these two to be one and the same. But in short, If our Saviour had said *Let this be Wine*, the meaning must have been, *Let this which is now Water become Wine.* If he had said, *This is Wine*, and the conversion not yet made, it would have been false: If after the conversion, no more than this, *This that is contained in these Pots is Wine*; or, *This which before was Water, now is Wine.*

And so in the point before us; Had our Blessed Saviour said, *LET THIS BE MY BODY*, and a conversion had been thereupon as truly made, as of the *Water* into *Wine*, we should have made no doubt, but that it was a command for that which before was *Bread* to become *his Body*. If we take the Words as they are, *THIS IS MY BODY*, and no conversion made before they were pronounced, the Proposition in the literal sense must plainly be false. If a real conversion had first been made, as when the *Water* was turned into *Wine*, then would it signify no more than this, *This which before was Bread, is now my Body.* So that all this will as little avail him, as he says the other did us, unless he also *beg the Question*, and suppose a real change made by these words, which he knows is the very thing which we deny; as we shall have reason to do, till they can prove that what, we are sure, was *Bread*, is converted into the *Body of Christ*.

And thus much for his *disputing*; Before he enters *Vindicat. p.* on an Examination of those Authorities I produced to 77, 78, 79, 80.

shew the novelty and uncertainty of *Transubstantiation*, he is willing to state the Case, and to that end would fain know what we mean when we say, that
*“Christ is not Corporeally present in this Sacrament :
 “Or how that which is not the thing it self, is yet more
 “than a meer figure of it. In answer to which, I shall
 need seek no farther than those Testimonies I before
 alledged out of the publick Acts of our Church to satis-
 tisfie him. Our Catechism affirms, “That the inward
 “part, or thing signified in this Holy Supper, is the BODY
 “AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, which are V E-
 “RILT AND INDEED taken and received by
 “the faithful in the Lords-Supper: And the meaning
 of it our 28th || Article expounds thus; “The Body of
 “Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Lord’s Supper,
 “ONLY AFTER A SPIRITUAL AND HEAVEN-
 “LY MANNER; and the means by which this is done,
 “is FAITH. So that to such as rightly, and worthily, and
 “with Faith receive the same, The Bread which we
 “break, is, as St. Paul declares it, The Communion of the
 “Body of Christ, and the Cup of Blessing which we bless,
 “The Communion of the Blood of Christ. In a word;
 We say, that the faithful do really partake of Christs
 Body after such a manner, as those who are void of
 Faith cannot, tho’ they may participate the Outward
 Elements alike; Whom therefore our Church declares,
 * Article 29. * To receive only the Sacrament of the Body and Blood
 “of Christ, but to be no way partakers of Christ; but
 “rather as St. Paul again says, to Eat and Drink their
 “own Damnation, not discerning the Lords Body.
 * † These are the Words of our Church; and the
 meaning is clearly this: Christ is really present in this
 Sacrament, inasmuch as they who worthily receive it,
 have thereby really convey’d to them our Saviour Christ,
 and*

See the Church
Catechism.

|| Article 28.

* Article 29.

* † See the
Appendix. N.
V. in which St.
Chrysostom
gives the very
same account
of it.

and all the benefits of that *Body* and *Blood*, whereof the *Bread* and *Wine* are the *outward Signs*. This great effect, plainly shews it to be more than a *meer Figure*; yet is it not his *Body* after the manner that the *Papists* imagine, “† *Christ's Body being in Heaven, and* † *Rubrick at the end of the Communion Office.*
 “*not on the holy Table; and it being against the truth of*
 “*Christ's natural Body, to be at one time in more places*
 “*than one.*”

The *Sacramental Bread* and *Wine* then remain still in their very *natural Substance*; nor is there any *corporal Presence* of *Christ's natural Flesh* and *Blood* at the *holy Altar*. The *Presence* we allow, is *Spiritual*, and that not only as to the *manner of the Existence* ¶, ¶ *Vindicat. p. 77, 78.* which the *Vindicator* seems to insinuate (for we suppose it to be a plain *Contradiction*, that a *Body* should have any *Existence* but what alone is proper to a *Body*, i. e. *Corporal*) but as to the *nature of the thing it* *That this Exposition is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Ch. of England, the Authorities already cited, shew.*
self; and yet it is *Real* too: The *Bread* which we receive, being a most *real* and *effectual Communion* of *Christ's Body*, in that *Spiritual* and *Heavenly* manner which *St. Paul* speaks of, and in which the *Faithful*, by *their Faith* are made partakers of it. *See also the*

Homily concerning the Sacrament, part 1: p. 283. &c. and the same is the *Explication*, which all the other *Protestant Confessions* have given of it; as is evident by the *Collation* of them made by *Bishop Cosins*, in his *History of Transubstantiation*, cap. 2. where he has set down their *Words* at large, p. 6. &c.

Thus does our *Church* admit of a *real Presence*, and yet †, neither take the *Words* of *Institution* in their † *Vindic. p. 80.*
literal Sense *, and avoid all those *Aburdities* we so * *Ibid. p. 79.*
 justly charge them with: As to the *Authorities* of their own *Writers*, which I alledged to shew that the *Doctrine* of *Transubstantiation* had no *Grounds*, neither in *Scripture* nor *Antiquity*: He is content to allow that the *Scriptures* are not so plain in this matter, but

Vind. p. 80, 81. but that it was necessary for the Church to interpret them in order to our understanding of it. And for Antiquity, he desires us to observe, 1st, "That the
 Ibid. p. 82. "Council of Trent having in the first Canon, defined the
 "true, real, and substantial Presence of the Body and
 "Blood of Jesus Christ in the most holy Sacrament, brings
 Seff. 13. Can. 2. "this Transubstantiation, or Conversion of one Substance
 "into another, as the natural Consequence of it. Can. 2. If
 "any one shall say, That the Substance of Bread and Wine
 "remains in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, together with the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus
 "Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the
 "Body, and of the whole Substance of the Wine into the
 "Blood, the Species of Bread and Wine only remaining;
 "which Conversion the Catholick Church does most aptly
 "call Transubstantiation, let him be Anathema.

The design of the Council in which Canon is evidently this, To define not only the real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, against the Sacramentaries, which before was done ||; but also the manner or mode of his Presence, against the Lutherans, in two Particulars; 1st, Of the Absence of the Substance of the Bread and Wine. 2ly, Of the Conversion of their Substance into the Body and Blood of Christ, the Species only remaining. But this the Vindicator will not allow, but advances an Exposition so contrary to the design of the Council, and Doctrine of his Church, that it is wonderful to imagine how he could be so far deceived himself, or think to impose upon others so vain and fond an Illusion.

Vindic. p. 83. "It is manifest, says he, that the Church does not here
 "intend to fix the manner of that Conversion, but only
 "to declare the matter, viz. That the Body and Blood
 " of

"of Jesus Christ becomes truly, really, and substantially
 "Present; the Bread and Wine ceasing to be there truly,
 "really, and substantially Present, tho the Appearances
 "thereof remain. Now this is so evidently false, that
 Suarez doubts not to say 'tis *HEREST* to affirm it,
 "Forasmuch, says he, as the Council not only determines
 "the **Presence of Christ's Body, and Absence of the**
 "**Substance of the Bread,** but also the true **Con-**
 "**version** of the one into the other; thus establishing, not
 "only the two former, but this last also as an Article of
 "Faith.

See Suarez cited below.

Our dispute therefore, is not only, as this Author pretends, about the real Presence of Christ's Body, and Absence of the Substance of the Bread, which he calls the thing it self; but also about the Manner, how Jesus Christ is Present; viz. Whether it "be by that WON-
 "DERFUL and singular CONVERSION which
 "their Church calls so aptly TRANSUBSTANTI-
 "ATION? Now this being that we are to enquire into, let us see whether the Authorities I have brought, have not the force I pretend against their Tenets.

Vindic. p. 83.

And 1. *LOMBARD* writing about this Conversion, plainly shews it to have been undetermined in his time. For having first asserted the real Presence in this Sacrament, and the change which he supposed was made upon that account: He goes on to that which the † *Vindicator* is pleased to call a Scholastick
Nicety; and it was indeed at that time no other, tho since become a matter of Faith, viz. What kind of
 Conversion is there made? Whether formal or substan-
 tial, or what else? And for this, he tells us freely, He
 is not able to define it: That some have thought it to be

† Vind. p. 92.

Lombard. l. 4. d. 11. lit. A. p. 735. De modis Conversionis. Si autem quæritur qualis

sit illa Conversio, an formalis, an substantialis, vel alterius generis, definire non sustineo: Quibuldam esse videtur substantia'is, &c.

a *SUBSTANTIAL CHANGE*; but for his part, he will not undertake to determine it.

¶ Dicendum, sicut Scotus, quod Ecclesia declaravit istum intellectum esse de veritate fidei. Si quæras, quare voluit Ecclesia eligere istum intellectum ita difficilem huius

But 2^{dly}, SCOTUS is yet more free ¶ He declares our Interpretation contrary to *Transubstantiation*, to be the more *easy*, and to all appearance the more *true*: Inasmuch, that the *Churches Authority* is the * *Principal thing* that moved him to receive their Doctrine. † He tells us that this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* was not very *Ancient*, nor any matter of *Faith* before the *Council of Lateran*; all which the *Vindicator* himself does in effect confess.

Articuli, cum verba Scripturæ possint salvari secundum intellectum facilem, & veriorum secundum apparentiam; Dico quod eo spiritu expositæ sunt Scripturæ, quo conditæ. See 4. Sent. d. 11. q. 3. p. 63.

* And before, in Sect. Quantum ergo, He profess'd, *Principaliter autem videtur me movere quod sic tenet Romana Ecclesia.*

In a Word, Bellarmine himself cites Scotus for this Opinion: "Non ex parte locum ullum Scripturæ, tam expressum, ut sine Ecclesiæ declaratione evidenter cogat *Transubstantiationem* admittere, Bell. de Euch. l. 3. c. 23. p. 767. L. D.

† And again, p. 768 L. A. Unum tamen addit Scotus, quod minime probandum est, *Ante Lateranense Concilium non fuisse dogma fidei Transubstantiationem.*

Vind. p. 88.

* Suarez in 3 part. D. Th. vol. 3 disp. 30. § 1. p. 593. Sacramentum Eucharistiæ conficitur per veram conversionem Panis & Vini in Corpus & Sanguinem Christi.

Hæc assertio est de fide: Nam licet sub his verbis non habeatur in Scriptura, ea tamen docet Ecclesia ab Apostolis edocta; docens simul ita esse intelligenda Verba formæ, & in vero sensu eorum hanc veritatem contineri. And then p. 594. col. 2. adds, 1^{mo}, Ex hac Fidei Doctrina, colligitur corrigendos esse Scholasticos qui hanc Doctrinam de Conversione hac, seu de Transubstantiatione, non admodum antiquam esse dixerunt, inter quos sunt Scotus & Gabriel Biel, lect. 41. in Can. Sc. And then, 2^{do} infero, Siquis confiteatur præsentiam corporis Christi, & absentiam Panis, neget tamen veram Conversionem unius in aliud, in HÆRESIN labi, quia Ecclesia Catholica, non solum duo priora, sed etiam hoc tertium definit ac docet.

which

which our good Author examined; but amidst all his sincerity, overlook'd this passage, as not much for his purpose; "That if any one should confess the real Presence of Christ's Body, and Absence of the Bread, and yet deny the true CONVERSION of the one into the other, he would fall into HEREST; forasmuch as the Church has defined, not only the two former, but also the third likewise. But,

4thly, The Prevarication of our Author in the next Citation is yet more unpardonable. I affirmed, "That Cardinal Cajetan acknowledged, that had not the Church declared her self for the proper Sense of the Words, the other might with as good reason have been received. This he says, is false; for that Cajetan says no such thing; nay, rather the contrary, as will appear to any one who reads that Article: And then with wonderful assurance, begins a rabble of Citations nothing to the purpose, in the very next Words to those in which mine end.

"For the better clearing of this Doctrine, says Cajetan in 3. D. Th. q. 75. art. 1. p. 130. Col. 1. In comment. circa presentis & sequentium Articulorum Doctrinam, pro claritate & ampliori intellectu difficultatum, sciendum est ex Autoritate S. Scripturæ de Existentiâ Corporis Christi in Sacramento Eucharistiæ, nihil aliud haberi expresse, nisi verbum Salvatoris dicentis, Hoc est Corpus meum: Oportet enim Verba hæc vera esse. Et quoniam verba sacra Scripturæ, exponuntur dupliciter, vel Proprie vel Metaphorice; Primus Error circa hoc fuit Interpretantium hæc Domini Verba Metaphorice; quem magister Sent. l. 4. c. 10. Tractat. Qui & hoc Articulo reprobatur. Et consistit VIS Reprobationis in HOC, Quod verba Domini intellecta sunt ab ECCLESIA Proprie, & PROPTEREA oportet illa verificari proprie Habemus igitur ex veritate verborum Domini in sensu proprio, &c. Cited by the Vindicator.

"these words *Metaphorically*, which is rejected in this *Article*. And the force of the Rejection consists in this, *That the words of our Saviour have been understood in their proper Sense by the Church, and therefore must be properly true.*

This the *Vindicator* was pleased to pass by, tho' the very next words to those he cites: Nay, to say, That *Cajetan* had no such thing in that *Article*; and appeal to any that should read it, for the truth of it. Should a *Protestant* have done this, he would, I believe, have found out a great many hard Names for him, to testify his Zeal against Falshood and Unfincerity, and shew what a kind of Religion that must be, that is *not maintainable without such sinister doings*: But I shall remit him wholly to the *Reader's Censure*, and his own *Conscience for Correction*.

Vind. p. 222.

Vindic. p. 88.

See p. 64.

As for my last Assertion, "*That Transubstantiation was no matter of Faith, till the Council of Lateran, 1200 years after Christ*": They are the very words of *Scotus* cited by *Bellarmino*, and all his *Sophistry* will not be able to prove that they make but little for my purpose.

Thus, notwithstanding all the little Endeavours of the *Vindicator*, to evade the truth of those Concessions made by the greatest of his own Communion in favour of our Doctrine, my Argument still stands good against them; and *Transubstantiation* appears to have been the monstrous Birth of these last Ages, *unknown in the Church for almost 1200 years*. For what remains concerning the *Adoration of the Host*, since he has thought fit to leave my Arguments in their full force; I shall not need say any thing in defence of that, which he has not so much as attempted to destroy.

Vind. p. 92, 93.

ARTICLE XIX.

Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

IF I affirmed, *The Sacrifice of the Mass* to be one of those Errors that most offends us; I said no more than what the *Church of England* has always thought of it: And had the *Vindicator* pleased to have examined my Arguments, instead of *admiring* them, he would perhaps have found I had reason to do so.

Vindic. p. 94.

** The *Council of Trent* affirms, "That the *Mass* is a true and proper Sacrifice offered to God, a Sacrifice not only of Praise and Thanksgiving, nor yet a bare Commemoration of the Sacrifice offered on the Cross, but truly Propitiatory for the Dead and the Living, and for the Sins, Punishments, Satisfactions, and other Necessities of both of them. † A Sacrifice wherein the same Christ is now offered without Blood, that once offer'd himself in that bloody Sacrifice of the Cross, the same Sacrifice, the same Offerer; Christ by his Priests now, who then did it by himself, offering himself, only differing in the manner of Oblation.

Concil. Trid.

Sess. 22. p. 196.

de Missa.

* Canon. 1.

Siquis dixerit

in Missa non

offerri Deo ve-

rum & propi-

um Sacrifici-

um, aut quod

offerri non sit

aliud, quam

nobis Christum

ad manducan-

dum dari, A-

nathema sit.

* Canon. 3.

Siquis dixerit *Missæ Sacrificium* tantum esse laudis & gratiarum actionis, aut nudam commemorationem Sacrificii in Cruce peracti, non autem Propitiatorium, vel soliprodesse fumentum, neque pro Vivis & Defunctis, pro peccatis, penis, satisfactionibus, & aliis necessitatibus offerri debere, Anathema sit.

† Ibid. Cap. 2. p. 191. Una eademque est Hostia, idem nunc offerens Sacerdotum Ministerio qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi ratione diversa.

This is in short, what their *Council* has defined as to this *Mass-Sacrifice*, and what we think we have good reason to be offended at. That there should be any true and proper Sacrifice, truly and properly Propitiatory, after that of the Cross; that Christ who once of-

Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

fer'd up himself upon the Tree for us, should again be brought down every day from Heaven, to be *Sacrificed* a new in ten thousand places at a time on their *Altars*: And by all these things so great a dishonour done to our Blessed Lord, as most evidently there is, and our Writers have unanswerably proved, in the whole design, Practice, and Pretences of it.

Vindicat. ib.

How little the Doctrine of the *real Presence*, as understood by the *Church of England*, will serve to support this Innovation, is at first sight evident from the Exposition I before gave of it. That those who are ordained *Priests*, ought to have power given them to Consecrate the *Sacrament* of the *Body and Blood of Christ*, and make them present in that holy *Eucharist*, after such a manner as our Saviour appointed, and as at the first Institution of this Sacred Mystery they certainly were, this we have always confessed; and our

† In the ordering of *Priests*, when the Bishop imposes his hands, he bids him be a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments: And again, when he delivers him the Bible, Take thou Authority to Preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments, &c. Sparrow Collect. p. 158.

† *Rituals* shew that our *Priests* accordingly have such a Power, by *Imposition of Hands*, conferred on them. But that it is necessary to the Evangelical Priesthood, that they should have power to offer up *Christ truly* and properly, as the *Council of Trent* defines, this we deny; and shall have reason to do so, till it can be proved to us, that their *Mass* is indeed such a Sacrifice as they pretend, and that our Saviour left it as an *Essential* part of their *Priesthood* to offer it.

Vindic. p. 95.

For the rest, If with the *Council of Trent*, he indeed believes the *Mass* to be a *true and proper Sacrifice*, he ought not to blame us for taking it in that Sense in which they themselves understand it: For certainly, it is impossible for words to represent a Sacrifice more strictly

strictly and properly, than the Council of Trent has defined this.

ARTICLE XX.

Of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

TO elude the authority of this *Epistle*, the *Vindicator*, after *Monsieur de Meaux*, thinks it sufficient to tell us, "That they understand the word Offer when they apply it to the *Mafs*, in a larger signification than what the Apostle there gives it; as when we are said to offer up to God whatever we present before him: And that 'tis thus they pretend to offer up the Blessed *JESUS* to his Father in the *Mafs*, in which he vouchsafes to render himself present before him.

Vindicat. p.
96, 97.

Mr. de M's Ex-
pos. p. 31.

Vind. p. 96.

That this is to prevaricate the true meaning of that phrase, the Doctrine of the foregoing Article plainly shews. If *Christ* be in the *Mafs* a true and proper sacrifice, as was there said, it will necessarily follow that then he must be truly and properly sacrificed: || And one essential Propriety, and which they tell us distinguishes a Sacrifice from any other Offering, being the true and real destruction of what is offered; inasmuch that where there is not a true and proper destruction, neither can there be, as they themselves acknowledge, a true and proper Sacrifice: It must be evidently false in these men to pretend, that by Offering in this matter is meant only a presenting of *Christ* before God, and not a real change and destruction of his Body offered by them.

|| *Sacrificium*
verum & reale,
veram & realem
Occisionem
exigit,
quando in Oc-
cisione ponitur
Essentia Sacri-
ficii.
Bellarm. de
Miss. l. i. cap.
27. p. 1663. A.

If

Reflections upon the foregoing Doctrine.

If in this *Exposition* of their *Doctrine* we do indeed misunderstand the meaning of it, we must at least profess it to be so far from any wilfull mistake, that we do no more than what their greatest men have done before us: And indeed it still seems most reasonable to us, that either this Sacrifice is no true and proper Sacrifice, as they say it is; or it is truly and properly offer'd, as we affirm they understand it to be.

ARTICLE XXI.

Reflections upon the foregoing Doctrine.

Vindicat. p. 97.

IF my *Reflections* in this *Article* be but as good, as my *Exceptions* in the foregoing have been just, against their *Doctrine*; what the *Vindicator* has said to these here, will I believe be found as little to the purpose, as what he endeavoured to reply to those before.

Rubrick about kneeling at the end of the Communion.

Tho' Christ be acknowledged to be really present after a *Divine* and *Heavenly* manner in this *Holy Eucharist*, yet will not this warrant the *Adoration* of the *Host*, which is still nevertheless only *Bread* and *Wine*, from being what our Church censures it, *Idolatry* to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; nor will such a real presenting of our Blessed Lord to his Father, to render him propitious to us, make the *Eucharist* any more than a *metaphorical*, not a true and proper propitiatory Sacrifice.

If these men please to fix upon us any other notion of the real presence than what has been said, and which alone our Church allows of; we are neither concerned

cerned in the Doctrine, nor shall we think our selves at all obliged to answer for those consequences they may possibly draw from it.

ARTICLE XXII.

Communion under both Species.

TO prove the lawfulness of their *denying the Cup* Vindicat. p 92.
to the Laity, the *Vindicator* advances three Arguments from the publick Acts of our own Church: The 1st. false; The 2^d. both false and unreasonable: The 3^d. nothing to the purpose.

1st. He says, the Church of England allows the Communion to be given under one species in case of Necessity: Art. 30. This is FALSE: The Article establishes both Kinds; and speaks nothing at all of any Case of Necessity, or what may, or may not be done on that account. "The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people, for both the parts of the Lords Sacrament, by Christ's Ordinance and Commandment, ought to be administered to all Christian men alike." See Art. 30. Sparrow's Col- lect. pag. 102, and 219.

2^{dly}. "Edward the sixth, he says, in his Proclamation before the order of Communion, ordains, That the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, should from thenceforth be commonly delivered and administered unto all Persons within our Realms of England and Ireland, and other our Dominions, under both kinds, That is to say of Bread and Wine, except necessity otherwise require."

This,

Communion under both Species.

See Sparrow's
Collect. p. 17.

This, as it is thus alledged by the *Vindicator*, is both *False* and *Unreasonable*: *FALSE*, for that *Edward* the 6th in that *Proclamation* does not ordain any such thing, but only says, That "*Forasmuch as in his High Court of Parliament lately holden at Westminster this was ordain'd, viz. That the most blessed Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, should from thenceforth be commonly Administred to all persons under both kinds, &c.* He for the greater Decency, and Uniformity of this Sacred *Eucharist*, now thought fit to appoint the following Form and Order for the *Administration* of it.

|| Note, That this order of Communion was the first thing of this kind that was done after the Reformation;

The Mass was yet left remaining; and *Edward* the 6th afterwards published two other Books, in which were considerable Alterations, and where there is no mention of any thing of this kind.

|| It is in the next place *UNREASONABLE*, to argue as to the present state of the *Church of England*, from what was allow'd only, and that in case of necessity too, in the very first beginning of the *Reformation*.

It was indeed the singular Providence of God, That in the 2d year of that Excellent Prince, things were so far Reformed from those long and inveterate Errors, in which the Ignorance and Superstition of Several Ages had involved the Church, That they had allowed, nay, commanded the *Holy Sacrament* to be given under *both kinds*, when for so many years it had been received only under *one*. But that labouring still under their former prejudices, they should in case of Necessity permit that, which had been the universal practice of the Church, without any necessity at all before; this is neither to be admired in them then, nor is it reasonable to urge it against us now.

His

His 3d Argument is not only *Unreasonable* upon the account we have now said; but were it never so proper, is absolutely *nothing to the purpose*. In the *Rubrick*, at the end of the same *Order of the Communion*, there is this Remark:

“ *Note that the Bread that shall be consecrated,* Sparrow’s Col-
 “ *shall be such as heretofore hath been accustomed;* lect. p. 24.
 “ *and every of the said consecrated Breads shall*
 “ *be broken in two pieces at the least, or more by*
 “ *the discretion of the Minister, and so distribu-*
 “ *ted. And men must not think less to be recei-*
 “ *ved in part than in the whole, but in each of*
 “ *them the whole Body of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*”

The meaning of which *Rubrick* is very plain; That whereas the people who had hitherto been accustomed to receive the *Wafer entire*, were now to have but a *part* of it given to them; to prevent any mis-conceits upon that account, as if because they did not receive *the whole Wafer* as they were wont to do, they did not receive *the whole Body*, i. e. the *Flesh of Christ*, (for as to the *Blood*, that they received afterwards in the *Cup*;) It was thought fit for the prevention of this scruple, to tell them, “ That they must not think less “ to be received in part than in the whole, but in each “ of them *the whole Body of Jesus Christ*; which what it makes for their *denial of the Cup to the Laity*, I cannot very well apprehend.

And now how well this Author has proved it to be *the Doctrine of the Church of England*, to dispence with the *Cup* in the *Holy Eucharist*, in case of necessity, I shall leave it to any indifferent person to judge. Tho’ after all, did we indeed, as some others do, believe
 O that

Communion under both Species.

Concil. Trid.
Sess. 21. Can.
1, 2.

that the Church had power to do this; How will this excuse them, who without any *necessary* or but *reasonable* cause deny it to the people altogether; and damn all those that will not believe "*they had not only power, but just cause and reason so to do?* And why will it not as well follow, that they may take away if they please *the whole Sacrament* from them, and Damn all those that will not believe *that they had just cause and power to do this too*; since even that *in Case of Necessity* may be dispensed with; and whilst there is no neglect or contempt of it, prove neither damnable nor dangerous?

PART

UMI

PART III.

ARTICLE XXIII.

Of the Written and Unwritten Word.

AS to this Article, there is indeed an Agreement between *Monsieur de Meaux* and *Me*, so far as We handle the Question, and keep to those general terms, *Of the Traditions being universally received by all Churches, and in all Ages*; for in this Case We of the Church of England are perfectly of the same Opinion with them, and ready to receive whatever we are thus assured to have come from the Apostles, with a like Veneration to that we pay to the *written Word* it self. But, after all this, there is, as the *Vindicator* observes, a very material difference betwixt us, *viz.* Who shall be judge when this *Tradition* is *Universal*?

Vindic. p. 100.

He tells us, “they rely upon the judgment of the present Church of every Age, declaring her sense, whether by the most General Council of that Age, or by the constant practice, and uniform voice of her Pastors and People. And this is that to which he conceives every private person and Church ought to submit, without presuming to examine how ancient that *Tradition* does appear to be, or how agreeable it is to the *Written Word of God*.”

Vind. ibid.

Now here we must own a dissent as to this method of judging of *Traditions*, for these two reasons:

O 2

I. Be-

1. Because whether there were any such particular Doctrine or Practice received by the Primitive Church, is a *matter of fact*, and as such is in many cases distinctly set down by such Writers as lived in or near that *first Age of the Church*. Now where the case is thus, the Accounts that are given by these Writers, are certainly to those who are able to search into them, a *better Rule* whereby to judge what was an *Ancient Doctrine and Tradition*, than either the *Decree of a Council of a latter Age*, or the *Voice and Practice of its Pastors and People*. For let these agree as much as they will in voting any *Doctrine or Practice* to have been *Primitive*, yet they can never make it pass for such among wise and knowing Men, if the *authentick Histories and Records* of those times shew it to have been otherwise. And this being plainly the case as to several instances decreed by the *Councils*, and practised by the *Pastors and People* in the *Roman Church*; we cannot look upon her late Decrees and Practices to be a good or a safe Rule for judging of the *Antiquity*, or *Universality* of *Church-Traditions*. But

2. There is yet a more cogent Reason against this *Method*, which is, that it is apt to set up *Tradition* in competition with the *Scriptures*, and to give this *Unwritten Word* the upper hand of the *Written*.

For, according to this *Method*, if the *Church* in any Age, does but decree in *Council*, or does generally *Teach and Practice* any thing as an ancient *Tradition*, then this must obtain and be of force with all its Members, tho' many of them should be perswaded that they cannot find it in, nay, that it is contrary to the *Written Word of God*.

Now this we cannot but look upon as an high affront to the *Holy Scriptures*: And let them attribute as much as they please to the *Decrees and Practices* of their Church,

Church, We cannot allow that any *particular Church* or *Person*, should be obliged upon these grounds to receive that as a matter of *Faith* or *Doctrine*, which upon a diligent and impartial search appears to them not to be contained in, nay, to be contrary to the *written Word of God*. In this Case we think it reasonable that the *Church's* Sentence should be made void; and the Voice of her *pretended Traditions* be silenced by that more powerful one of the *lively Oracles of God*.

ARTICLE XXIV, XXV.

Of the Authority of the Church.

I N the two next Articles, concerning the *Authority* Vind. p. 101:
of the Church, I was willing to allow as much, and come up as near to *Monf. de Meaux*, as Truth and Reason would permit. This it seems made the *Vindicator* to conceive some great hopes from my Concessions. But these his hopes are soon dashed, when he finds me putting in some Exceptions, and not willing to swallow the whole Doctrine, as it is laid down in the *Exposition*.

Now the Exceptions that seem most to offend him, are these,

1. That the *Church of Rome* should be taken for a *particular*, and not the *Catholick Church*.

2. That She should be supposed as such, either by *Error* to have lost, or by *other means* to have *prevaricated* the *Faith*, even in the *necessary points of it*.

3. That any other *Church* should be allow'd to examine and judge of the *Decisions* of that *Church*.

4. That it should be left to *private* or *individual Persons* to examine and oppose the *Decisions* of the whole *Church*,

Church, if they are evidently convinced that their private belief is founded upon the *Authority of God's Holy Word*.

Vind. p. 103. These are the Exceptions, at which he is the most offended: The 1. of these, he calls an Argument to elude the *Authority of the Church of Rome*; and to shew the Fallacy of it, he thinks it sufficient to say, "That they do not take the *Church of Rome*, as it is the *Suburbican Diocess*, to be the *Catholick Church*, but all the *Christian Churches in Communion with the Bishop of Rome*. Now if this, in truth, be that which they mean, when they stile the *Church of Rome* the *Catholick Church*, then surely every other *National Church* which is of that Communion, has as good a title to the name of *Catholick*, as that of *Rome* it self. For seeing it is the Purity or Orthodoxy of the Faith, which is the bond of this Communion, this renders every *distinct Church* professing this Faith, equally *Catholick* with the rest; and reduces the *Church of Rome*, as well as others, within its own *Suburbican Diocess*, and so makes it only a *particular*, not the *Universal Church*.

But now, should we allow the *Church of Rome* as great an extent as the *Vindicator* speaks of, and that it were proper to understand by that name, all those *other Churches* which are in *Communion* with her; yet all this would not make her the *whole* or *Catholick Church*, unless it could be proved, that there was no other *Christian Church* in the *World* besides those in *Communion with her*; and that all *Christian Churches* have in all *Ages* profess'd just the same Faith, and continued just in the same Worship as She hath done. And this we conceive will not easily be made out with reference to the *Greecian*, *Armenian*, *Abassine Churches*; all which have plainly for several *Ages* differed from the *Church of Rome*, and those in her *Communion*, in points relating both

both to Faith and Worship: So that in respect of these and the like *Christian Churches*, which were not of her *Communion*, She could not be looked upon as a *Universal*, but only as a *Particular Church*.

Now if this be so, then the *Vindicator* himself allows, *Vind. p. 102.*
 2dly, That a *Particular Church*, may either by *Error* lose, or by *other means prevaricate* the *Faith*, even in the *necessary points of it*. Indeed that promise of our Saviour, *That the gates of Hell should not prevail against his Church*; seems on all hands acknowledged, to refer to his *whole Church*, not to any one *particular Branch* or *Portion*. And therefore, tho' the *particular Church* of Rome should have fallen into gross Errors both in matters of Faith and Practice; yet the *Catholick Church* of *Christ* may still, as to other of its members, retain so much Truth and Purity, as to keep it from falling away, or being guilty of an intire Infidelity. And then for the

Mat. 16. 18.

3d. Exception, The allowing any other *Particular Church* to examine and judg of the Decisions of this *Church* of Rome: If She her self be but a *particular Church*, and has no more Command or Jurisdiction over the Faith of other *Churches*, than they have over hers; then every other *National Church* is as much impow'ed to judg for her self, as She is, and has an equal right to examine her *Decisions*, as those of *other Churches*; and may either receive, or reject what by Gods Grace directing her, She Judges to agree or disagree with his *Holy Word*. Nor do's one Branch of *Christ's Church* in this respect invade the *Prerogative* of another; since they do herein only follow the Apostles Rule, in trying all things, and holding fast that which is good.

But the 4th Exception, he says, "is yet more intolerable than all the rest: That it should be left to every individual
Vind. p. 102.

Ibid. p. 103.

“individual Person, not only to examine the Decisions of
 “the whole Church, but also to glory in opposing them, if he
 “be but evidently convinced that his own belief is founded
 “upon the undoubted Authority of God’s Holy Word. This,
 “he says, is a Doctrine, which if admitted, will main-
 “tain all Dissenters that are, or can be from a Church, and
 “establish as many Religions as there are Persons in the
 “World.

These indeed, are very ill Consequences, but such as do not directly follow from this Doctrine as laid down in my *Exposition*. For 1st, I allow of this Dissent or Opposition, only in necessary Articles of Faith, where it is every Mans concern and duty, both to judg for himself, and to make as sound and sincere a Judgment as he is able: And 2^{dly}, As I take the *Holy Scriptures* for the Rule, according to which this Judgment is to be made, so do I suppose these *Scriptures* to be so clearly written, as to what concerns those necessary Articles, that it can hardly happen that any one man, any serious and impartial Enquirer, “should be found opposite to the whole Church in his Opinion.

Now these two things being supposed, that in matters of Faith, a man is to judg for himself, and that the *Scriptures* are a clear and sufficient rule for him to judg by; it will plainly follow, That if a man be evidently convinced, upon the best Enquiry he can make, that his particular Belief is founded upon the Word of God, and that of the Church is not; he is obliged to support and adhere to his own belief in Opposition to that of the Church. And the Reason of this must be very evident to all those who own, not the Church, but the *Scriptures*, to be the ultimate rule and guide of their Faith. For if this be so, then individual Persons, as well as Churches, must judg of their Faith, according to what they find in *Scripture*. And tho it be highly
 useful

useful to them, to be assisted in the making of this Judgment by that *Church*, of which they are Members; yet, if after this Instruction, they are still evidently convinced that there is a disagreement in any necessary point of Faith, between the Voice of the *Church* and that of the *Scripture*, they must stick to the latter rather than the former, they must follow the superior, not inferior Guide.

And however this method may through the Ignorance or Malice of some men, be liable to some Abuse; yet certainly, in the main, it is most Just and Reasonable, and most agreeable to the *Constitutions of the Church of England*, which do's not take upon her to be *Absolute Mistress* of the Faith of her Members, but allows a higher Place and Authority to the guidance of the *Holy Scripture*, than to that of her own Decisions.

See Article 20.

As to the Authority, by which I back'd this Assertion, viz. that of St. *Athanasius*, tho' it is not doubted but that that Expression, of *his being against the whole World, and the whole World against him*, did refer chiefly to the *Eastern Bishops*; and was not so literally true as to those of the *West*; yet, if we consider what compliances there were even of the *Western Bishops*, at *Ariminum* and *Sirmium*, and how Pope *Liberius* himself, tho' he refused to subscribe the form of Faith, sent to him from *Ariminum*, and was for that reason deposed from his Bishoprick, and banished out of *Italy*; yet afterwards, when the Emperor *Constantius* sent for him to *Sirmium*, and required his assent to a form of Faith, in which the word *ὁμολογῶν*, was purposely omitted, he yielded thus far, and was thereupon restored to his Bishoprick; I say, if we consider these and the like Particulars related by the Church Historians, we shall have little reason to believe that the *Western Bishops*, or even the *Pope himself*, did thoroughly adhere to the

Sozomen Eccl.
Hist. lib. 4.
cap. 15.

Of the Authority of the Holy See,

Faith of St. *Athanasius*; and therefore, that neither was *He* or *I* much in the wrong, in affirming, "That he stood up in defence of *Christs Divinity*, when the *Pope*, the *Councils*, and almost the whole Church fell away."

ARTICLE XXVI.

Of the Authority of the Holy See, and of Episcopacy.

Vindic. p. 106.

IN this Article the *Vindicator* is pleased to declare that he has nothing to say against the Opinion of the Church of England; only he thinks fit to advise me to enquire, What that Authority is which the Ancient Councils of the *Primitive Church* have acknowledged, and the *holy Fathers* have always taught the faithful to give the *Pope*. Indeed, a very little inquiry will serve the turn to let a man see, that their *Pope* do's at this day, lay claim to a great deal more than those Councils or *Fathers* did ever allow him. And we should be glad he would direct us to those places, either in the first Councils or the *Primitive Fathers*, where the *Pope* is stiled the *Universal Bishop*, or the *Supreme Head on Earth of the whole Christian Church*; where it is said, That he is *Christs immediate Vicar*; and that all other Bishops must derive their Authority from him. These are things which he do's now pretend to, but we can find no Footsteps of them in the first Councils or *Fathers* of the Church. On the contrary, we find innumerable passages which plainly shew, that no such Title or Authority was anciently claimed by, or allow'd to the *Bishop of Rome*: And therefore we say, That these

these new and groundless pretences must be laid aside, before we can be content to yield him that Honour, which has been sometimes given to his Predecessors.

As to that new Question he has hookt in at the end of this Article, "*Whether the first four General Councils* Vindic. p. 106, "*might not be term'd neither General nor Free, with as much reason as the Council of Trent*; I suppose it may easily be answer'd in the *Negative*.

1st, It was not so *General*, because it was not call'd by so great and just an *Authority* as those were: That was an *Authority* to which Christians of all Places, and all Ranks, acknowledged themselves bound to submit, and attend where they were summon'd by it; whereas this was a meer *Usurpation*, and being so, was not regarded by a great part of the Christian World, who were sensible that they ow'd no Subjection to it.

2^{dly}, It was not so *Free*, because those who had most to say in defence of the Truth, durst not appear at *Trent*, being sufficiently forewarn'd by what others had lately suffered in a like case at *Constance*: Add to this, That those who being present, did set themselves most to oppose Error and Corruption, were perpetually run down, and outvoted by Shoals of new made Bishops, sent out of *Italy* for that purpose. So that such a *Council* as this, could not with any shew of Reason be termed, either *Free* or *General*, much less ought it to be compared with those *first four Councils*, which were in all these Respects most opposite to it.

CLOSE XXVII.

AND now, that I have gone through the several Vindic. p. 106, Articles of the *Vindication*, and found the Pretensions of this *Author* against me as false, as I think I

have shewn his Arguments to have been frivolous; what shall I say more? Shall I complain of his Injuries, or rather shall I yet again beseech him to consider the little grounds he had for them; and see whether he has been able in any one Instance, to make good that *infamous Character*, which he has told the World, I have deserved in almost every *Article* of my *Exposition*.

Have I *Calumniated* them in any thing? Have I *Misrepresented* their *Doctrines*? I have already said, I do not know that I have; I think I may now add, I have made it appear that I have not.

Where are the *Unsincere dealings*, the *Falsifications*, the *Authors Miscited*, or *Misapplied*? Excepting only an Error or two, that's the most, of the Prefs; has he given any one Example of this? Some words now and then I omitted, because I thought them impertinent, and was unwilling to burden a short Treatise with tedious Citations. And I am still perswaded that they were not material, and that he might as well have found fault with me for not Transcribing the whole Books, from whence they were produced, as for leaving out those Passages which he pretends ought to have been inserted. And for this, I appeal to the foregoing *Articles* to be my *Vindication*.

Vind. p. 120.

But our Author has well observed "*That nothing can be so clearly expressed, or so firmly established, let me add, or so kindly and charitably performed, but that a person who intends to cavil, may either form a seeming Objection against it, or wrest it into a different sense.*"

I never had the vanity to fancy my *Exposition* to be *Infallible*, or that the sight of an *Imprimatur* should make me pass for an *Oracle*. But yet I was willing to hope, that amidst the late pretences to Moderation, such

such a peaceable *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England* might at least have been received with the same civility by them, as that of the *Church of Rome* was by us; and that our new *Methodists* had not so wholly studied the *palliating* part of their Master, as not to have learnt something of his *fairness* and *civility* also.

This I had so much the greater reason to expect, for that it has been esteemed not the least part of the *artifice* of *Monsieur de Meaux*, not only to mollify the *Errors* of his *Church*; but to moderate that passion and heat that for the most part occurs in the defenders of it: And by the temper and candidness of his *Stile*, insinuate into his Reader a good Opinion of his *Doctrine*.

But this is an *Artifice* that our late Controvertists seem resolved we shall have no great cause to apprehend. Who therefore have not only wholly laid aside the *Moderation* of this *Prelate*; but have in some of their last Pieces fallen into such a vein of *lightness* and *scurrility*, as if their Zeal for their Church had made them forget that *Religion is the Subject*, and *Christians and Scholars*, to say no more of them, *their Antagonists*.

I am ashamed to say, what *mean Reflections*, and *trivial Jestings* make up almost the sum of their latest attempts. *The Papist Represented*, which seemed to promise something of seriousness and moderation, expiring in a *FANATICK Sermon*; done indeed so naturally, as if the once Protestant Author had dropt not out of the *Church of England*; but a *Conventicle* into *Popery*. His late *Majesties Papers Answered with Reason*, and (whatever is pretended) with *respect* too by Us; instead of being *Vindicated*, *ridiculed* in the *Reply*: In which it is hard to say, whether the Author has least shewn his *charity* to us, or his *respect* to the

the *Persons* and *Church* that he defends. These are the new *Methods* that are now taken up; but sure such as neither *Church* I suppose will be very well satisfied with: And which seem more accommodated to the *Genius* of those *Sceptics* who divert themselves at the expence of *All Religion* on both sides, than designed to satisfy the *sober* and *conscientious* of either.

Amicab'e Accommodation.

It is not improbable but that some such ingenious Piece may in a little time come forth against what I have now publish'd; to call me a few ill names, pass a droll or two upon the Cause, tell the World how many Sheets there were in my Defence, and put the curious to another *Shilling expence*, as a late Author has very gravely observed. If this be the Case, I hope I shall need no Apology to men of sense and sobriety, if I here end both their trouble and my own together. Let those who have been always used to it, rally on still with Holy things if they think good; for my part I esteem the *Salvation of mens Souls*, and the *Truth of Religion*, to be a more *serious* Subject than to be exposed to the levity of a *Jest*, and made the subject of a *Controversial Lampoon*. And if an account shall hereafter be given for every idle word that we now speak, I profess I cannot but tremble to think what shall be the judgment of those men, who in the midst of such unhappy differences as the Church now labours under; whilst our common Mother lies almost dissolved in tears for the divisions of her Children, and her dutiful Sons on both sides are praying and endeavouring with all their industry to close them; like an unnatural off-spring, divert themselves in the quarrel, find a harmony in her groans, and make a *droll* of that, which had they indeed any true *zeal for Religion*, they ought to wish rather they could with their dearest Blood be so happy as to redress.

For

For what remains of the *Vindication*, I shall say but very little to it. "He enters upon his Conclusion with *a tragical harangue of the hardships they have suffer'd, both by, and ever since our Reformation; and how well we deserve their Excommunication upon that account.* And 'tis no hard matter when men so well disposed, as this Author seems to be, to speak evil of us, are to draw our *Character*, to make it appear as *odious and deformed* as they desire.

Were I minded to recriminate, I need not tell those who are but very little acquainted with the true History of these things, what a fair field I should have for a requital. The *corruptions* of the *Church* when this *Reformation* begun; the *unchristian lives* of those *Religious Inhabitants* that, he says, were *turn'd by us into the wide world*; the *Cheats and Ignorance* of the *Clergy*; the *Tricks and Artifices* of their *Popes* to prevent that *Reformation*, which many of their own Party, no less than the Protestants, desired both in the *Head* and the *Members*; And since he mentions *Cruelties*, the barbarous *Butcheries* executed on the Reformed in *Savoy, Bohemia, Germany, Ireland*; and to say no more, the *proceedings* at this day in one of our *Neighbour Countries*, whereof we have been our selves *Eye-witnesses*, and of which, the noble *Charity* of our *Royal Sovereign* towards *these poor distressed Christians*, notwithstanding all the vain endeavours of some to hide it, suffers no *honest Englishman* now to doubt; All these would furnish out matter enough for a Reply, and satisfy the World, that were the *Reformed* as bad as *Hell* it self could represent them, the *Romanists* yet would of all men living have the least cause to complain of them.

But I desire not to heighten those Animosities, which I so heartily wish were closed; and would rather such things

Vindicat. p.
106, 107.

See the words
of His Maje-
sty's Brief.

things as these might on all hands be buried in eternal oblivion, than brought forth to prevent that Union, we had never more cause to hope for than at this time. And for our *Laws* which, he says, have been made against them, he knows well enough what occasion was given to *Queen Elizabeth* and *King James* the 1st to establish them; and I shall rather refer him to the

|| See that and
a Vindication
of it by the
Secular Priests
An. 1601. pub-
lished with some other pieces in a Collection, called, The Jesuits Loyalty. 4to.

|| Answer which my Lord *Burleigh* made above 100 years since to this complaint, than take the opportunity, he has so fairly given me, to revive the Reasons.

Vindicat.
p. 111.

As for those *injuries* he tells us that *Perjury and Faction* loaded them with; we are not concerned in them. It is well known that the *Church of England* was no less, if not more, struck at in those times than themselves: *If their present change of fortune makes them indeed neither remember those injuries, nor desire to revenge them*, it shews only that the favour of Providence has not made them forgetful of their duty; nor their present prosperity unmindful of their future Interest. This is not our concern, who have never that we know of injured them, unless to take all fair and lawful ways to defend our Religion as by Law established, may possibly, in some mens apprehensions, be esteemed an injury.

The peace and liberty which we enjoy, we do not ascribe to their Civility; it is Gods Providence and our Sovereign's bounty, whom the *Church of England* has ever so Loyally served; whose Rights She asserted in the worst of times, when to use our Authors own words, "*Perjury and Faction for this very cause, loaded her with all the injuries Hell it self could invent.*" But we gloried to suffer for our duty to Him then, and shall not fail, should there ever be occasion, to do it again.

again. And we have this testimony from our *King*, which no time or malice shall be able to obliterate, That *the Church of England is by principle a Friend to Monarchy*, and I think cannot be charged to have ever been defective in any thing that might serve to strengthen and support it.

For what remains with reference to the *Points in Controversie*, the foregoing Articles are but one continued confutation of his vain pretences: And I shall only add this more to them, that whenever he will undertake to make good any one thing that he has advanced against us, either in his *Book or Conclusion*; I will not fail to *prove* what I now *affirm*, That there is not a word of truth in either of them.

In the mean time, before I close this, I cannot but take notice, how much *the state of our controversie* with these men has of late been changed; and what hopes we are willing to conceive from thence, as to the sober part of their Communion, that those *Errors* shall in time be *reformed*, which they already seem not only to have *discovered*, but to be *ashamed* of.

When our Fathers disputed against *Papery*, the *Question* then was, Whether it were lawful to *Worship Images*; to *Invocate Saints*; to *Adore Reliques*; to *depend upon our own Merits for Salvation*; and *satisfie for the pain of our own Sins*. This was their task; and they abundantly discharged it, in proving these things to be unlawful, contrary to our duty towards God, and to the Authority of Holy Scripture.

But now in these our days, there is started up a new Generation of men, too wise to be imposed upon with those illusions, that in blind and barbarous Ages had led the *Church* into so much *Error* and *Superstition*. These see too clearly, that such things as these must, if possible, be deny'd, for that they cannot be maintain'd.

And they have accordingly undertaken it as the easier task, by *subtile distinctions*, and *palliating expressions*, to wrest the *definitions* of their *Councils* to such a sense as may serve the best to protect them from these Errors; rather than to go on in vain with their Predecessors, to draw the *Scripture* and *Fathers* into the Party to defend them.

And that it may not be said I speak this at all adventures, I will beg leave in a short recapitulation of what is largely proved in the foregoing Articles, to offer a general view of it.

Of Religious Worship.

Old Popery.

New Popery.

A * **T**IS a wicked and foolish Error of the Lutherans and Calvinists, to attribute * Religious honour ONLY to God. And therefore such Sentences as these, "That God only is to be adored: That no creature is to be adored, must be put into the Index Expurgatorius, to be blotted out of S. Athanasius and other Authors in which they do occur.

* *Impius & Imperitus Lutheranorum & Calvinistarum Error est, nulum nisi Deo Religionis honorem tribuentium. Maldonat in Matt. 5. 34. pag. 126. B. Index Expurgat. in Athanas. Adorari solius Dei est; Creatura nulla Adoranda est. Dele. pag. 52.*

A **R**eligious honour or worship if taken strictly and properly is due only to God: *Soli Deo honor & gloria*. We ought not to deprive God of any thing that is due to him alone; neither honour, nor worship, nor prayer, nor thanksgiving, nor sacrifice. We may honour those whom God has honoured; but so as not to elevate them above the state of creatures. And this may be called a Religious love or honour, when it is done for God's sake, yet it is but an Ex-

New Popery.

Extrinfecal Denomination

from the cause and motive, not from the nature of the Act. *Vind.* p. 27, 28.

Invocation of Saints.

Old Popery.

^A * *I* *T* is necessary to pray to the Blessed Virgin. *It is the intention of God that we should obtain both Grace and Glory by her : That all men might be saved by the Merits of the Son, and the Intercession of the Mother.* * *Crafft.* p. 30, 31.

† *The Curates therefore shall diligently instruct the people, That the Saints who reign together with Christ, do offer to God their Prayers for Men : That it is good and profitable in a suppliant manner to invoke them ; and recur to*

New Popery.

^A *F*or *Invocation of Saints*, we only tell you it is lawful to pray to them ; *Vind.* p. 30. That we do it in the same spirit of Charity, and in the same order of brotherly society with which we intreat our Friends on Earth to Pray for us.

Monsieur de Meaux, p. 3.

^B If we mention their Merits, 'tis only those Victories they had obtained by his favours, which we beseech him to look upon, and not regard our unworthiness. *Vind. ib.*

^C As to the recommending our Sacrifices to God by

* *Speaking of S. Bernard, he concludes, C'est decette grande Verité qu'il conclut que nous sommes obligez indispensablement de l'honorer & de la prier ; Quia sic est Voluntas dei, qui Totum nos habere voluit per Mariam. Il veut que Nous ayons par Marie la Grace & la Gloire : And p. 33. Il veut que tous les hommes soient sauvés par les merites du fils & par l'intercession*

de la Mere ; d' autant que Dieu a resolu de ne nous faire aucune Grace qui ne passe par les mains de Marie. Comme on ne peut estre sauvé sans Grace, il faut dire qu'on ne le peut estre que par Marie, qui est le canal de toutes les Graces qui descendent du Ciel en Terre.

† *Mandat S. Synodus omnibus Episcopis, & cæteris docendi munus curamq; sustinentibus, ut — de Sanctorum — Invocatione fideles diligenter instruunt ; Docentes eos, Sanctos una cum Christo Regnantes Orationes suas pro Hominibus Deo offerre : Bonum atq; Utile esse suppliciter eos invocare ; & ob beneficia impetranda à Deo per filium ejus Jesum Christum, ad eorum Orationes, Opem, Auxiliumq; confugere.* p. 291, 292.

Old Popery.

their Prayers, Help, and Assistance, for the obtaining Blessing of God by his Son.

Concil. Trid. Sess. 23. c. de Invocatione, Sc. ff.

Upon this account in all their publick service of the Church they address

their Prayers to them, after the same manner that they do to Christ, together with whom, the Council A says, They Reign in Heaven: So that if 'tis necessary to go to Church, 'tis necessary to pray to them. They confess their Sins to them; * they dismiss departing Souls out of this World in their Names; they make direct Addressees to them as the Council speaks, not only for their Prayers, but also for their Help and B Assistance; they desire for their Merits to be heard by God; and that he would accept their Sacrifices themselves C for the sake of the Saints they Commemorate; as in the 3d Article of this Treatise is fully to be seen.

* Ord. Commend. Animæ.
p. 120.

New Popery.

their Prayers, as if Christ who is the Sacrifice, needed any other to recommend him to his Father, we detest such Thoughts, we abominate such Doctrines.

Vindicat. p. 30.

Worship of Images.

Old Popery.

A :: THE Images of A Christ and the Saints, are to be venerated, not only by accident and improperly, but properly and by themselves, so as to terminate the

New Popery.

THE use we make of Pictures or Images, is purely as representatives, or memorative Signs, which call the Originals to our Remembrance.

Vindicat. p. 35.

Imagines Christi & Sanctorum venerandæ sunt non solum per accidens vel improprie, sed etiam per se & proprie; Ita ut ipsæ terminent Venerationem ut in se considerantur, & non solum ut vicem gerunt Exemplaris.

Wor-

Old Popery.

New Popery.

Worship upon them, and that as consider'd in themselves, and upon their own account, not only as they are the Representatives of the Original, *Bellarm. de Imag. l. 2. p. 2148.*

A * The Wood of the Cross is to be Adored with Divine Adoration; and upon this account, if the Popes Legate at any time conduct the Emperor into any City, his Cross must take place of the Emperor's Sword; "Because a Divine Worship is due to it, Pontific. See above, art 4. p. 15.

A || This Adoration is properly to the Cross, as is evident, in that the Church invites the People on Good Friday to Adore it; and in its Hymns distinguishes the Cross from Christ, and addresses to the Cross, as such. See Article 4. above, ib.

B * The Church of Rome in praying to God, that several Vertues may proceed from the Cross, shew it to

When the Church pays an Honour to the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, her Intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image. *Expos. M. de M. p. 8.*

Nor do we attribute to them any other Vertue, but that of exciting in us the remembrance of those they represent. *Id. p. 8. Vind. p. 31.*

The Honour we render them, is grounded upon this, that the very seeing of Jesus Christ crucified, cannot but excite in us a more lively Remembrance of him, who died upon the Cross for our Redemption: Now whilst this Image before our Eyes, causes this precious Remembrance in our Souls, we are naturally moved to testify by some exterior Signs, how far our Gratitude bears us; which exterior Signs are not paid to the Image, but to Jesus Christ represented by that Image. *Vindicat. ib. p. 31.*

Monf. de Meaux Expos. p. 8, 9.

* Pont. Rom. p. 205. See above, p. 15, 16, 17.

|| Missal. Rom. feria VI. in Parascev. p. 247.

* Pontificale de Benedictione nove Crucis, p. 161.

CLOSE.

Old Popery.

be their Opinion, that it has other Vertues, than barely to excite the remembrance of those they represent.
See above in the Consecration of a new Cross. Art. 4. p. 16, 17.

Of Reliques.

Old Popery.

† Thom. 3.
 par. qu. 25.
 Art. 6. p. 54.
 See above p.
 22, 23.

A † **S**eeing we Adore the
 Saints of God, we
 must also Adore their Re-
 liques. Thomas.

A This is an undoubted
 truth amongst Catholicks,
 That the Reliques of the
 Saints, whether they be a-
 ny parts of them, as Bones,
 Flesh, Ashes, or Some o-
 ther things that have
 toucht them, or belonged
 to them, are to be ado-
 red.

Vasquez, See above,
 Art. 4. p. 50.

Vasquez in 3
 part. D. Tho.
 disp. 112. p.
 808.

¶ Ita ut affir-
 mantes Sancto-
 rum Reliquiis
 Venerationem
 atque Hono-
 rem non debe-
 ri, vel eas ali-
 aque sacra
 Monumenta à
 fidelibus inutiliter honorari, atque eorum opis impetranda causa, Sanctorum memorias
 frustra frequentari, omnino damnandi sunt, p. 292, 293.

¶ Those are to be condemned, who affirm that no Wor-
 ship or Honour is due to the Reliques of Saints; or
 B that those sacred Monuments are unprofitably reve-
 red by the Faithful; or that for obtaining their
 Help, men ought not to frequent the Memories of the
 Saints. Concil. Trid. Sess. 25. c. de InvoCAT. &c.

New Popery.

WE honour Reliques
 as we do Images,
 for those whom they be-
 long'd to. Vind. p. 40.

A We will not quarrel
 how we ought to call this
 Respect and Honour, p. 43.
 Vind. but it is not Wor-
 ship, Ib. p. 42.

B We seek not to them
 for any Aid and Assistance,
 to cure the Blind, &c. and
 are therefore falsly char-
 ged with so doing, Vind.
 p. 41.

Of Justification.

Old Popery.

* **B** *Y* Justification is to be understood, not only Remission of Sins, but Sanctification, ^A and renewing of the inward Man.

Concil. Trid.

If any one shall say ^B *Works.* that men are Justified, either by the alone Imputation of Christs Righteousness, or only by the Remission of Sins, excluding Grace and Charity, which is diffused in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, and inheres in them; or that the Grace by which we are Justified is only the Favour of God, Let him be Anathema.

Concil. Trid. ib. See above, Art. 5. p. 53.

^B * *If any one shall affirm the works of a justified man to be so the gifts of God, that they are not also the good merits of the justified man himself; or that he being justified by the good Works which are perform'd by him, through the Grace of God, and Merit of Jesus Christ, whose living Member he is, do's not truly merit increase of Grace and Eternal Life; let him be Anathema.* Conc. Trid, Sess. 6. c. 32.

New Popery.

T Hey impose upon us who say that we make our inward righteousness a part of Justification; and by Consequence hold that our Justification it self is also wrought by our good

* Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. Cap. 7. p. 31.

Vind. p. 47.

* See above, Art. 5. p. 27.

Of Merits.

Old Popery.

New Popery.

Maldonat. in
Ezek. 18, 20.
p. 425.

WE do as truly *and properly, when we do well by Gods Grace merit Rewards, as we do deserve Punishment, when without his Grace, we do ill.* Maldonat.

Bellarmin. de
Justificatione
lib. 5. cap. 17.

A *The Works of just Persons, are truly equal to the Reward of Eternal Life; as the Work of those who labour'd in the Vineyard to the peny which they earned: And God by his Covenant is bound to accept it for the reward of Eternal Life. This is the Doctrine of the Council of Trent.*

Bellarmin. ses. art. 6. above.

Vasquez in D.
Th. 122. q.
114. disp. 214.
p. 800.

A *They, therefore, are to be condemned who think our Works of themselves, not to be worthy of Eternal Life, but to have the whole nature of Merit that is in them, from the Covenant and Promise of God. This was the Opinion of Scotus, condemn'd above Art. 7. p. 31, 31.*

Vasquez ibid.
p. 917. Sc.

Christ indeed, first obtain'd Grace for us, whereby we might be enabled to work out our own Salvation; but this being done, we have no more need of Christ's Merits

Eternal Life ought to be propos'd to the Children of God, as a Grace that is mercifully promis'd to them, by the Mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ; and a recompence that is faithfully render'd to their good Works, and Merits, in Vertue of this Promise.

Expos. M. de M. p. 11.

We ask all things, we hope all things, we render thanks for all things, through our Lord Jesus Christ, we confess that we are not acceptable to God, but in and by him. Ib. p. 12.

Old Popery.

Merits to supply our defects: But our own good Works are of themselves sufficient to Salvation, without any Imputation of his righteousness.

Vasquez, See above l. c.

Of Satisfaction.

Old Popery.

A **T**O this Question whether our Works are to be called truly and properly Satisfactory? || Bellarmin replies, That they are; so that we may be said truly and properly to satisfy the Lord.

See above, Art. 7.

|| It is immediately our Satisfaction, and Christ's only, in as much as we receive Grace from him, whereby we our selves may be able to satisfy.

Id. ib. Art. 7.

As to mortal Sins, Gods Grace being supposed to be given to us in Christ, Vasquez declares, We do truly satisfy God for our Sins and Offences. As for venial Sins, we do so satisfy, as not to need any Grace or Favour of God to forgive our Sins, or accept our Satisfaction; but our Satisfaction is such, as doth in its own nature blot out both the stain and punishment of Sin. Vasquez above, l. c.

New Popery.

A **T**hey impose upon us, who say that we believe that by our own endeavours we are able to make a true and proper Satisfaction to God for Sin.

Vindicat. p. 54, 55.

B That which we call Satisfaction, following the Example of the Primitive Church, is nothing but the Application of the infinite Satisfaction of Jesus Christ.

M. de M. Expos. p. 15.

|| Bellarm. de Pœnit. lib. 4. cap. 7.

|| Bellarm. lib. 1. de Purgat. cap. 10.

Vasquez in 3 part disp. 2. See above, Art. 7.

Old Popery.

¶ Quidam asserunt, Nos proprie non satisfacere, sed solum facere aliquid cujus

intuitu Deus applicat nobis Christi Satisfactionem: Quæ sententia erronea mihi videtur. Bellarm. de Purg. l. 1. c. 10. p. 1899. A. B.

|| *There are some who say, That we do not properly satisfy, but do somewhat for the sake of which God applies to us Christs Satisfaction; This Opinion seems to me to be Erroneous.* Bellarm.

Of Indulgences.

Old Popery.

Bellarm. de Indulgentiis lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 3.

THere being in all Sins a temporal Punishment to be undergone after the Eternal, by the Sacrament of Penance, is remitted; We call Indulgence the Remission of those Punishments that remain to be undergone after the forgiveness of the Fault, and Reconciliation obtain'd by the Sacrament of Penance.

Ibid. cap. 2.

The Foundation of these Indulgences, is the Treasure of the Church, consisting partly of the Merits of Christ, and partly of the superabundant Sufferings of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, who have suffer'd more than their Sins required.

New Popery.

WE believe there is a Power in the Church of granting Indulgences; which concern not at all the Remission of Sins, either Mortal or Venial, but only of some temporal Punishments remaining due after the guilt is remitted. So that they are nothing else but a Mitigation, or Relaxation, upon just Causes of Canonical Penances, which are, or may be enjoyn'd by the Pastors of the Church, on Penitent Sinners, according to their several degrees of demerit.

*Papist Represent, n. viii. p. 10.
M. de M. Expos. § 8. p. 14.*

Old Popery.

The Pastors of the Church have obtain'd from God Ibid. c. 3. p. the power of granting Indulgences, and dispensing of 19, 27. the Merits of Christ, and the Saints, for this end, out of the Sacraments.

The Punishments remitted by these Indulgences, Ibid. c. 7. p. 47. are all those which are, or might have been enjoyn'd for Sins; and that whether the Persons be alive or dead.

Of the Mass.

Old Popery.

New Popery.

A **T**He * Mass is a true and proper Sacrifice: A Sacrifice not only Commemorative of that of the Cross, but also truly and properly propitiatory for the dead and the living. Conc. Trent. Art. 16.

B † Every true and real Sacrifice requires a true and real Death or Destruction of the thing sacrificed: So that if in the Mass there be not a true and real Destruction

THe Sacrifice of the Mass * Concil. Trid. Sess. 22. Can. 1. & 3. p. 196. was instituted only to represent that which was & ibid. c. 2. p. 191. accomplish'd on the Cross, to perpetuate the memory of it to the end of the World, and apply to us the saving Vertue of it, for those Sins which we commit every day.

B When we say, That Christ is offered in the Mass, we do not understand the word Offer in the strictest Sense, but as we

† Verum & reale Sacrificium. veram & realem mortem aut destructionem rei immolatæ considerat. Bell. de Missa l. 1. c. 27. p. 1062. C.

Vel in Missa fit vera & realis Christi mactatio, & occisio, vel non fit: Si non fit, non est verum & reale Sacrificium Missæ: Sacrificium enim verum & reale, veram & realem occisionem exigit, quando in occisione ponitur essentia Sacrificii. 1063. A.

And again, Per consecrationem res quæ offertur, ad veram, realem, & externam mutationem & destructionem ordinatur, quod erat necessarium ad rationem Sacrificii. ib. l. 1. D. Sect. Tertio.

Old Popery.

on, *there is not a true and real Sacrifice.*

Bellarmin.

To offer up Christ then in the Eucharist, is not only to present him before God on the Altar, but really and truly to Sacrifice, i. e. destroy him.

Bellarmin.

New Popery.

are said to Offer to God what we present before him. And thus the Church does not doubt to say, That She offers up our Blessed Jesus to his Father in the Eucharist, in which he vouchsafes to render him himself present before him.

Vindicat. ibid. p. 96.

Of the Popes Authority.

Old Popery.

WE acknowledge the Holy Catholick, and Roman Church, to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; and we Promise and Swear to the Bishop of Rome, Successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ, a true Obedience.

Concil. Trid. Jur. Pii 4ti p. xlv. in fine.

Si dominus
temporatis
requisitus &
monitus ab Ecclesia,

The Pope has Power to depose Princes, and ab-

terram suam purgare neglexerit, ab Hæretica sceleritate. Excommunicationis Vinculo innodetur. Et si satisfacere contempserit infra annum, significetur hoc summo Pontifici, ut ex tunc, Ipse Vassallos ab ejus fidelitate denuntiet absolutos, & terram exponat Catholicis occupandam. — Salvo jure Domini Principalis, dummodo super hoc ipse nullum præstet obstaculum, nec aliquod impedimentum opponat: Eadem nihil ominis lege servata circa EOS qui NON HABENT DOMINOS PRINCIPALES.

New Popery.

WE acknowledge that Primacy which Christ gave to St. Peter, in his Successors; to whom, for this cause, we owe that Obedience and Submission, which the holy Councils and Fathers have always taught the faithful.

As for those things which we know are disputed of in the Schools, it is not necessary we speak

Old Popery.

New Popery.

solve Subjects from their Allegiance: *So the Council of Lateran: "If the*

"Temporal Lord shall neg-

"lect to purge his Land of

"Heresie, let him be Ex-

"communicated; and if

"within a year he refuses

"to make satisfaction to the

"Church, let it be signified

"to the Pope, that from

"thenceforth, He may de-

"clare his Vassals absolved

"from their Allegiance;

"and expose his Land to be seised by Catholicks—yet

"so as not to injure the right of the Principal Lord. Pro-

"vided that he puts no stop or hindrance to this: And

"the same Law is to be observed with reference to those

"who have no Principal Lords.

of them here, seeing they are not *Articles of the Catholick Faith.*

It is sufficient we acknowledge a *Head* Establish'd by God to conduct his whole Flock in his Paths, which those who love Concord amongst Brethren, and Ecclesiastical Unanimity, will most willingly acknowledg.

Expos. Monsieur de Meaux. p. 40.

Concil. Later. 4. Can. 3. de Hæret. p. 147.

This is no Scholastick Tenet, but the Canon of a Council received by the Church of Rome as General.

Such is the difference of the present *Controversies* between us from what they were, when it pleased God to discover to our *Fathers* the Errors they had so long been involved in. Were I minded to shew the division yet greater, there want not *Authors* among them, and those approved ones too, from whence to collect more desperate *Conclusions* in most of these *Points*,
than

than any I have now remark'd. And the Practice and Opinion of the people, in those *Countries* where these *Errors* still prevail, is yet more *Extravagant* than any thing that either the One or Other have written.

What now remains, but that I earnestly beseech all sober and unprejudiced Persons of that *Communion*, seriously to weigh these things; And consider what just reason we had to quit those *Errors*, which even their own *Teachers* are ashamed to confess, and yet cannot honestly disavow.

It has been the great business of these new *Metho-dists* for some years past, to draw over ignorant men to the *Church of Rome*, by pretending to them that their Doctrines are by no means such as they are commonly mis-apprehended to be. This is popular, and may I believe have prevailed with some weak persons to their *seduction*; tho' we know well enough that all those abroad who pretend to be *Monsieur de Meaux's* *Profelytes* were not so upon the conviction of his Book, but for the *advantages* of the *Change*, and the *Patronage* of his *Person and Authority*.

But surely would men seriously weigh this *Method*, there could be nothing more strong for our *Reformation* than this one thing, That the wisest and best men of the *Roman Church* esteem it the greatest honour and advantage they can do to their *Religion*, to represent it as like ours as is possible; and that their strongest argument to make *Profelytes* is this, That were things but rightly understood, there is but very little or no difference at all betwixt us.

And would to God indeed this were truly so! that these *differences* were not only as *small* as they pretend, but *wholly taken away*: With what joy should we
em-

embrace the happy return of so many of our lost Brethren into the Arms of their *Mother*? How should we go forth with the highest transports to welcome them into our Communion? And celebrate the joyful festival on Earth, which would create an Exultation even among the blessed *Angels* and *Saints* in Heaven.

And why shall we not hope that this in time shall be the issue? The good work is already begun; The *Errors* are many of them *discover'd*, and, what is more, *disavow'd*: And wherefore should we then distrust the Mercy of Heaven to hear our Prayers, which we never make with more real zeal and fervour than in their behalf; to shew them the Truth, and open their Eyes to a perfect Conviction?

Till this be accomplish'd, Let us, who by God's Grace are already Members of the *Church of England*, that is, of the best *reform'd*, and best *establiſh'd Church* in the *Christian World*, so seriously weigh these things, as not only to *stand stedfast in that Faith* which has been delivered to us, but to use our utmost endeavours to convince others also of the Excellence of it.

Let not any fond pretences of *Antiquity* or *Possession* Vindic. p. 112, amuse us. Against *God* and *Truth* there lies no *pre-ſcription*; nor ought we to be at all concern'd to forsake Errors, tho' never so *Ancient*, for more *Ancient Truths*.

Let no prospect or temptation, whether of *worldly evils* on the one hand, or *worldly advantages* on the other, draw us from our *steadfastness*. *God is faithful* 1 Cor. 10. 13. *who will not suffer us to be tempted above what we are able*: And he who for any of these things *denies Christ* Matt. 10. 33. *or his Religion on Earth*, shall be *denied by Christ before his Father which is in Heaven*.

But

C L O S E.

But let us be firm and sincere to God and our own Souls; careful to search out, and ready to embrace the Truth wherever we find it. So shall our *lives* be *Orthodox*, tho' perhaps our *faith* should not; and if in any thing we do err, for we pretend not to *Infalibility*, nor is it therefore impossible for us to be mistaken, yet at least *we shall not be HERETICKS.*

F I N I S.

5

APPENDIX

Containing a

COLLECTION

Of the following PIECES.

- I. *The Extract of a Letter written from Paris concerning Monsieur de Meaux's Pastoral Letter.*
 - II. *An Extract of Father Crasset's Doctrine concerning the Worship which the Roman Church allows to the Blessed Virgin.*
 - III. *Cardinal Bona's Exposition, and Practice of the same.*
 - IV. *Monsieur Imbert's Letter to Monsieur de Meaux, proving that his Persecution was truly for maintaining the Doctrine of that Bishop's Exposition.*
 - V. *The Epistle of St. Chrysostome to Cæsarius, suppress'd by some of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, for being contrary to the Roman Canon of Transubstantiation.*
 - VI. *A Catalogue of the Editions made use of by me in my Quotations, to prevent, if it may be, all future Calumnies.*
-

LONDON, Printed MDCLXXXVI.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following Pieces have so near a relation to the present Controversie, and are in themselves of so great a Moment, that if their length deny'd them a place in the Work it self, their Importance hath made it necessary not to omit them here. I have prefix'd to every one of them such particular Accounts as may serve to satisfy the *Reader's* Curiosity concerning them; and shall, I hope, be a sufficient Apology for me, that I have so largely insisted upon them.

APPENDIX.

A P P E N D I X.

NUM. I.

The Extract of a Letter written from Paris concerning Monsieur de Meaux's Pastoral Letter.

TO shew that *Monsieur de Meaux* does not always so write at first, as not to stand in need of any Correction afterwards, I will beg leave to subjoin the *Extract* of a Letter dated from *Paris*, concerning his late *Pastoral Letter*; which, 'tis there said, he is about to change somewhat in; whether only for the better advantage of the *Method*, and greater neatness of *Stile* (as in his *Exposition*) we shall be better able hereafter to judge.

It is in the last Nouvelle Juin 1686.

Pag. 736, 737.

ON écrit de *Paris*, que *M. de Meaux* retranchera de la 2 Edition de sa *Lettre Pastorale* l'endroit où il dit

They write from *Paris*, that *Monsieur de Meaux* will retrench in the second Edition of his *Pastoral Letter* the

S 2

place

aux nouveaux Catho-
liques de son Diocèze,
*Qu'ils n'ont point souf-
fert de Violence en leurs
Biens, ni en leurs Person-
nes, & qu'il a onî dire
la même chose aux autres
Eveques.*

Je ne sçauois dire pre-
cisément si ce sont ces
propres mots, car je n'ay
point veû cette *Lettre
Pastorale*, je sçai seulement
que c'est ce qu'on escrit
de Paris.

Ce Prelat a eu en vûe
dans sa *Lettre*, de prepa-
rer à la *Communion Pas-
chale* ces nouveaux Dio-
cezains. Je ne sçai pas
ce qu'ils ont fait, mais
ailleurs quand on a pre-
senti les *Convertis*, on
leur a trouvé si peu de
disposition à *communier*
à Pâques, qu'on n'a pas
jugé à propos de pouf-
ser l'affair.

Dans la dernier *Fête-
Dieu* plusieurs ont mieux
aimé payer une *Amende*,
que de tendre devant
leurs Maisons.

place where he tells the
new Converts of his Dio-
ces, That they have not
suffer'd any Violence ei-
ther in their Goods, or in
their Persons, and that he
heard the other Bishops
say the same.

I cannot say precisely
whether these were his
very words, having ne-
ver seen his Pastoral Let-
ter, I only know this,
that thus they write from
Paris.

The design of this
Prelate in his Letter, was
to prepare his new Dio-
cesans to communicate at
Easter. What they did,
I cannot tell, but in o-
ther parts when they
presented the Converts in
order to receive it, they
found them so little di-
sposed to communicate at
Easter, that they have not
thought fit to force them
to it.

Upon Corpus Christi
day last, many of them
chose rather to pay a
fine, than put up hang-
ings before their Houses
for the Procession. A-

Après cela, il est apparent que *M. de Meaux* retranchera l'endroit ci-dessus marqué, & que les Gens d'honneur se plaindront *in petto* de ce qu'on se tue de leur soutenir, que les *Huguenots* ont signé le *Formulaire* le plus volontairement du monde. Bien entendu, que ces gens d'honneur n'auront pas le tour d'*Esprit & de Conscience*, du quel nous avons parlé ci-dessus, pag. 471.

After this, 'tis more than probable that *M. de Meaux* will strike out the passage above-mention'd, and that men of sense will complain in their minds to be thus eternally wearied with their pretences, that the *Hugonots* have signed the *Formulary* with all the readiness in the world. Always provided, that these men of sense be not endow'd with that turn of Wit and Conscience, of which we have spoken heretofore, pag. 471. above.

NUM. II.

An Extract of Father Crasset's Doctrine concerning the Worship which the Roman Church allows to the Blessed Virgin.

M*onsieur de Meaux* is very much of opinion, that Father *Crasset* has nothing in his Book contrary to the Principles of his *Exposition*. I must transcribe his whole Book, would I insist upon every thing in it opposite to this Pretence: But I shall content my self for the present to propose only to
Monsieur

Monsieur de Meaux some of this Fathers *Questions*; that he may please to tell us whether he be indeed of the same Opinion with the Father in them. 'Twill be an admirable *Vindication* of his *Exposition*, and we shall not doubt, after that, of its being a true Representation of the *Doctrine* of the *Roman Church*.

Question 1.

Page 31.

Whether the Intercession of the Blessed Virgin to God for us, be not only profitable, but necessary to our Salvation?

1 P^r. trait. 1.
9. 4.

Resp. I do not find the Father positive in his assertion here, but at least he recounts abundance of their *Saints* that are so: *St. Germain*, *St. Anselme*, *St. Bernard*, the *Abbè de Celles*, *St. Antonine*, and *St. Bernardine*; whose horrid *Blasphemies* see at large repeated and approved.

Qu. 2.

Page 39.

Whether a tender and constant Devotion towards the Blessed Virgin, be not a mark of Predestination?

Page 39, 40.

"ANSWER. This is what we read in all Books;
"hear from all Pulpits: There are but few *Catho-*
"licks but what are of this Opinion, and that this
"Devotion towards the *Mother of God*, is a mark
"of *Salvation*, the good Father undertakes to
"prove by the Authority of the *Scripture*, explain'd
"by the *Fathers*, and confirmed by *Reason*.

Qu. 3.

Qu. 3.

" *Whether a Christian that is devout towards the* Page 54.

" *Blessed Virgin can be damned ?*

" ANSWER. The Servants of the *Blessed Virgin* Page 57.
 " have an *Assurance, morally infallible*, that they
 " shall be saved.

Qu. 4.

" *Whether God ever refuses any thing to the Bles-* Ibid.
 " *sed Virgin ?*

" ANSWER 1. The *Prayers of a Mother* so hum- Page 60, 61.
 " ble and respectful, are esteemed a *Command* by a
 " *Son* so sweet and so obedient. 2. Being truly our
 " *Saviour's Mother* as well in *Heaven* as she was on
 " *Earth*, she still retains a kind of *natural Authority*
 " over his *PERSON*, over his *GOODS*, and over his
 " *OMNIPOTENCE*: So that as *Albertus Magnus* says,
 " *she cannot only intreat him for the Salvation of her*
 " *Servants, but by her MOTHERLY AUTHORITY can*
 " *COMMAND him*; and as another expresses it, *The*
 " *Power of the Mother and of the Son is all one, she*
 " *being by her Omnipotent Son, made HER SELF OM-*
 " *NIPOTENT.*

Qu. 5.

" *What Blessings the Virgin procures for her* Page 91.
 " *Servants.*

" ANSWER 1. " *She preserves them from Error* and Page 92.
 " *Hereſie*, if they are in danger to fall into it; and
 " *recovers them out of it, if they are fallen.* 2. *She* Page 93.
 " *defends*

- " *defends* and *protects* them in their *Temptations*
 " against their *Enemy*; and this not only *Men*, but
 " other *Creatures*; insomuch that a Bird which a
 " young Lady had taught to say his *Ave Maria*, be-
 " ing one day seized by a Hawk, whilst he was in
 " his Claws, said only his *Ave Maria*, and the Hawk
 " terrified with the *Salutation*, let him go, and so
 " he return'd to his Mistress. 3. She *comforts* them
 " in their *Distresses*, *assists* them in their *Dangers*,
 " *counsels* them in their *Doubts*, *eases* them in their
 " *Pains*, *animates* them in their *Combats*, and final-
 " ly, *procures* them a good *Death*. To this end,
 " 4. She gives them a timely *foreknowledge* of
 " their *Death*, that they be not surpris'd. She
 " sends the *Angels* to assist them in it, and sometimes
 " comes her own self in Person. 5. She *obtains*
 " them the *Grace of Repentance* if they are in *Sin*,
 " and of *Perseverance*, if they be in a State of
 " *Grace*.
- Page 94.
 Ib. 95.
 Ib. 96.
 Ib. 97.
 Page 98.

Qu. 6.

- " *Whether the Blessed Virgin has ever fetcht*
 " *any out of Hell.*
- Page 99.

- " ANSWER I. As to *Purgatory*, 'tis certain that
 " the *Virgin* has brought several *Souls* from thence,
 " as well as refresh'd them whilst they were there.
 " 2. 'Tis certain she has fetcht many out of *Hell*, i. e.
 " from a State of *Damnation* before they were
 " dead. 3. The *Virgin* can, and has fetcht men
 " that were dead in *mortal Sin* out of *Hell*, by re-
 " storing them to Life again, that they might re-
 " pent; which the Father proves at large, for the
 " *Establishment of our FAITH and of our HOPE.*
- Page 100.
 Page 102.

Qu. 7.

Qu. 7.

"What Honour ought we to render to the Blessed Virgin? ^{2 Part. Pag. 73.}

"ANSWER. We ought to render to her a *Religious Honour*. ^{Pag. 79.}
 2. To honour her *Images* also
 "with a *Religious Honour*, as sacred things; and
 "this the many *Miracles* done by them do require. ^{Pag. 92.}
 "3. To build Temples to her, which many grave
 "Authors do assure us was done, before her *Birth*,
 "during her *Life*, and since her *Death* and *Coronation* in *Heaven*. ^{Pag. 99.}

Qu. 8.

Whether it be good to make Vows and Pilgrimages to the Honour of the Virgin? ^{Pag. 138.}

"ANSWER. It is good to make *Vows*, and under-
 "take *Pilgrimages* to the places where she is specially honoured. ^{Ibid.}

The Practice of Devotion towards Her.

1. "To wear her *Scapulary*: which whoso does, ^{Pag. 315.}
 "shall not be damned, but this Habit shall be for
 "them a *Mark of Salvation*, a *Safeguard in Dangers*,
 "and a *Sign of Peace* and *eternal Alliance*.
 "They that wear this *Habit*, shall be moreover ^{Pag. 316.}
 "delivered out of *Purgatory* the *Saturday* after their
 "death.

2. To enter into her *Congregations*. ^{Pag. 321.}
 "And if any man be minded to save himself, 'tis im-
 "possible for him to find out any more *advantageous* ^{Pag. 322.}
 "means, than to enrol himself into these Companies.

T

3. To

Pag. 339.

3. To devote ones self more immediately to Her Service: For which the Father gives several very grave Forms. *Ib. & seq.*

These are some of the Heads of Father *Craffet's* Book. It were infinite to recount his particular Folies, with which every Page and Sentence is croud-ed. And however *Monsieur de Meaux* is pleased at a Venture to espouse all this, yet I must still beg leave to believe, that he neither approves this Practice, nor will receive these Principles. And these things, not only *Monsieur de la B——*

in his Answer, but the Author of the *Preservative* at large alledged against him; which being a Book so well known in *France*, and mentioned to *Monsieur de Meaux* in a particular manner by * *Monsieur Imbert* in his Letter to him, and having caused such Contests between † *Monsieur Arnauld* and the || *Vindicator* of the *Preservative*, upon this very account, still increases my Wonder, that for all this, *Monsieur de Meaux* should never hear there was any thing in this Book of Father *Craffet's*, contrary to his *Exposition*, nor believe the *Father* to be of any *Opinion* repugnant to his *Principles* therein established.

The Reader may please to remember, that this Book of Father *Craffet's* was licensed by the *Provincial*, approved by the *Fathers of the Society*, permitted, and privileged by the *King*, and printed by the *Archbishop of Paris's Printer*, 1679.

* In his Letter below N. 4.

† Reflexions sur le Preservatif, &c.

|| Le Janse-niste convaincu de vaine Sophistique. Article 7. pag. 72. &c.

NUM. III.

*Cardinal BONA's Doctrine and Practice
of this Worship.*

IN my Preface to my former Treatise, to shew with how little Sincerity many times those of the Church of Rome will approve Books, whose Principles they dislike; I observed that Cardinal Capisucchi had in his *Controversies* plainly contradicted, in the point of worshipping Images, what he approved in *Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition*. This, *Monsieur de Meaux* saies, cannot be, for this admirable Reason, "*qu'on trouvera son approbation expresse parmi celles que j'ai rapportées* ; that his exprels *Approbation* has been given to his Book.

I have already said what I thought sufficient to the Consequence of this Answer: But now to satisfy the Reader that Cardinal Capisucchi is not the only Person that has thus complemented *Monsieur de Meaux* contrary to his own Principles and Conscience, I will here offer another plain Instance in *M. de Meaux's learned and holy Cardinal BONA*, Avertissement de l' 5 Edit. François, 12mo. Paris 1681. pag. 21. whose memory, he saies, shall be for ever blessed in the Church. This learned Cardinal was desired by *Card. Buillon* to examine the *Exposition* with all rigour, because that some persons accused it of certain Defects; and he assures him that he did *particularmente osservare in che potesse esser ripreso*; particularly observe whether there were any Fault in it. The effect of this particular Observation was very

favourable to *Monsieur de Meaux*: The Cardinal found nothing but matter of great Satisfaction to himself, and Praise to the Author; and yet has this man as flatly opposed *Monsieur de Meaux's* Principles in the Point of Invocation of Saints, before-mention'd, both in his *Doctrine* and *Practice*, as 'tis well possible for words to do it.

For *Monsieur de Meaux's* Doctrine, I shall not need say any thing here, after what I have so fully accounted above: The Reader may please to compare it with the Extract I shall now offer him out of Cardinal Bona's Works.

Oper. Tom. 2. In his *Dedication* which he makes of his Book of DIVINE PSALMODY to the Blessed Virgin, thus he concludes to her:

"Possess me as your own, O Sovereign QUEEN of
 "Heaven! and seeing it has pleas'd you in this Ora-
 "tory dedicated to your Service, to bestow so many
 "Favours upon distressed Mortals, suffer not me to
 "go hence without some mark of it. Renew your
 "Tokens, change your Miracles. As you are wont to
 "open the Eyes of the blind, that they might be-
 "hold the light, now open the Eyes of my Mind,
 "and fill them with your brightest light, that I may
 "with a pure Contemplation, behold the Light of God's
 "Countenance that is impressed upon us. If ever
 "you have cleared the stopp'd Ears of the Deaf;
 "Give Joy and Gladness to my inward Hearing, that
 "I may hear the Voice of the Bridegroom speaking
 "in silence to the Heart of Jerusalem. If you have
 "here broken the Chains of dumb Tongues, Give to
 "my Mouth a right and well-sounding Speech, that
 "when I sing the Praises of God, my Words may be
 "pleasing in the presence of the eternal King. If
 you

"you have restored Health to the diseased, heal me
 "who labour under an inveterate Sickness, that my
 "Mind may in the last day be found intire, without
 "the Sickness of any evil Affection. This I most hum-
 "bly beg, here prostrate upon my Knees, before this
 "wonder-working Image of yours, and upon that
 "solemn day which your Nativity has rendred venera-
 "ble to us.

Such is the Entrance he makes upon this Book, and
 indeed the work that follows is all of a piece. In
 his 16. Chapter, Page 551. He gives this account, *Tom. 2.*
 why in all their OFFICES they conclude with a Prayer, *Pag. 551.*
 or some Complement at least, to the Blessed Virgin. "It
 "is to this end, that if by humane frailty they have
 "committed any Errour in the dreadful Service of
 "God, our Lord being appeased by her Mediation,
 "may not impute it to them for sin: For SHE pre-
 "serves all those that trust in Her. She reaches out
 "her saving Hand to those, who in this damnable
 "World are in danger. She restrains the malicious
 "Endeavours of our Enemies. No Day, no Hour,
 "not a Moment passes, without some Favour of Hers.
 "Her the Heavenly Host Worship, Hell it self Ob-
 "serves, the World Adores. Her Majesty the chief-
 "est of the Blessed Spirits tremble at. By Her Order
 "the World is Govern'd; the Stars give Light, the
 "Sun shines, the Winds blow, the Gardens spring,
 "the Woods grow, the Seasons keep their constant re-
 "volutions, the Elements serve our needs. The Orna-
 "ment of our Manners, the brightness of our Works,
 "all this we receive from Her Favour, when we
 "Worship and Venerate Her. The Church knows
 "of how great danger it is to have her exiled Chil-
 "dren divorced from the Care of their most indulgent
 Mother,

"Mother, and therefore by a most wise Counsel has
 "decreed, that they should by a frequent Observance
 "fly to Her Protection; not only by instituting a
 "special Office to Her, but by addressing to Her in
 "the end of all her Offices, according as the reason of
 "the times should require.

See especially how extravagant his Verses are, when the Prose is
 c. 12. p. 304.
 666.
 This is a short Specimen of what is scattered up
 and down in all the Parts of his Book; I need not say
 thus high flown: I will give but one Instance more,
 which one would think should contain, if any, a
 certain account of his Perswasion, taken out of his
Last Will; in which, having commended himself to
 our Blessed Saviour, he comes in the next place, as
 is most fit, to the *Virgin*, and so on to the rest of
 his *Friends* and *Patrons* above. Page 37. *Tom.* 3.

See his Will
 in the begin-
 ning of the
 3. *Tom.*

"And to thee also, O Blessed Virgin MARY, Mother of
 "Mercy, Queen of the World, Comforter of the Afflict-
 "ed, Refuge of Sinners, Salvation of those that
 "perish, to thee, O Fountain of Piety, in this dread-
 "ful Hour, I commend my Soul. Help me now that
 "am afraid; Lift me up that am falling; Direct me
 "that am in Error, Comfort my Soul that is desolate,
 "and Obtain of thy beloved Son for me, the Mercy
 "which I have desired. You have always mercifully
 "Assisted me in all my Dangers; O forsake me not
 "in this last, on which Eternity depends.——

"Holy Michael! Archangel! who camest to help
 "the People of God, Prince of the Heavenly Host——
 "Deliver me from the Snare of unclean Spirits, and
 "bring my Soul into a Place of comfort and refresh-
 "ment.

"And thou, Holy Angel, to whose Safeguard and
 "Protection I unworthy Sinner have been committed,
 "Assist

"*Assist me in this moment, Drive far from me all
 "the Power of Satan; Save me from the Mouth of
 "the Lion.—Draw me out of the Snare which they
 "have laid for me, and Preserve my soul from their
 "evil designs.*

"*Assist me you also, O my Patrons, and tutelary
 "Saints! Thou first of all, O St. JOHN, forerunner
 "of Christ,—Make my Paths straight, and Direct
 "my way in the sight of the Lord. Blessed PETER!
 "Key-Bearer of the Heavenly Kingdom! Prince of
 "the Apostles! by the Power that is committed to thee,
 "Loose thou the Bonds of my Sins, and Open unto
 "me the Gate of Paradise.*

"*And thou, O Glorious Father of the Monks of St.
 "Benedict! impute not thou unto me to my Damnati-
 "on, the innumerable transgressions that I have made of
 "thy Rule.—O ye Captains and Heads of the Holy
 "Order of the Cistercians, St. ROBERT, St. ALBERIC,
 "St. STEPHEN, and St. BERNARD; who have so long pa-
 "tiently endured me an unfruitful Tree in this your
 "Vineyard.—O Forsake me not in this Hour! But
 "Remember that I am your Son, tho' unworthy the
 "Name.—*

The Cardinal goes still further on with the rest of his Patrons; (for he had taken care to provide enough of them) but I fear I have tired the Reader with these I have already transcribed. Monsieur de Meaux, I know, will tell us, that all this is no more than if he had desired as many of the good Company that were about him at this time, to have done the same; and for his *Expressions*, though they are some of them a little *Extraordinary*, yet the Cardinal's intention, no doubt, like that of the Church, was to have them all reduced to this one and the same Catholic meaning, *PRAY FOR ME.* And

* See the *Procès verbal de l'Assemblée extraordinaire des Messieurs l'Archevêques & Evêques en Mars & May 1681.*

Mr. de Meaux himself was one of this *Assembly*, and signed with the rest the Report of the *A. B. of Reims*, in which there is abundantly sufficient to shew how repugnant his *Holiness's* Proceedings were to the *Doctrine* of the *Exposition*, approved by him at the very same time that he was engaged in these attempts so contrary to it.

I know not whether it be worth the observing, that the very same day the *Pope* sent his complementing

Brief to *Monsieur de Meaux*, in *Approbation* of his *Exposition*; he sent another to the *Bishop of Pamiers*, to approve his defending the Rights of his Church, against the *King*: which was judg'd in the *Assembly*, of which *Mr. de Meaux* was one, to be an interposing in an *Affair*, which neither the *Holy Councils* nor *Fathers* had given him any Authority to meddle with.

And for those who are resolved to believe this fond Pretence, there is no hopes of conviction.

But for unprejudiced Persons, who see the Vanity, indeed the unreasonableness and absurdity of this Evasion, I doubt not but they will find a plain *Opposition* between *Monsieur de Meaux's* Principles and the *Cardinal's*, and that this good *Man* needed a very great *Apology* to his *Patrons*, for having approved a *Doctrine* so derogatory to their *Power* and *Honour*, as that of the *Exposition* in his Opinion undoubtedly was.

But I shall say no more to shew the *unsincerity* of *Cardinal BONA* in this matter: I might have added a yet greater instance, than either of these *Cardinals*, of the same pious *Fraud*, in the *Approbation* of the *POPE* himself; * whose *Briefs*, with reference to the Affairs of *France*, and which this *Bishop*, who has had so great a part in them, could not be ignorant of, however publish'd at the same time that he sent his Complement to *Mr. de Meaux*, do but ill agree with his *Exposition*. Indeed, they run in such a strain, as plainly shews, that were but his *Power* equal to his *Will*, he would soon convince the World, that not this *Mans* Pretences, but the *Dictates* of *Pope GREGORY VII.* the *UNAM SANCTAM Bull*, and the *Canon* of *LATERAN*, were the true *Exposition* of the *Doctrine* of the *Catholick Church*.

And of this I am ready to make an ample proof, from the several pieces set out by publick Authority in *France*, when ever *Mr. de Meaux* or his *Vindicator* shall think fit to question the truth of what I now say.

NUM. IV.

Copie d'une Lettre écrite à Monsieur l'E-
vêque de Meaux, cy devant Evêque de
Condom.

Au Port de St. Marie ce 13. Juin 1683.

Monseigneur,

Votre Grandeur rapellera, sans doute, mieux l'Idée
de mon nom, lors que je luy dirai que je suis
celuy pour qui elle a eu la bonté de parler il y a environ
16 ans à Madame de Chaune pour avoir son consente-
ment d'une Chapelle, comme tutrice de Monsieur de—
& j'eus l'Honneur de la voir plusieurs fois à St. Tho-
mas du Louvre, avec Messieurs de Périgieux &
de Xainte.

Depuis ce tems là, j'ai souffert la Persecution, &
particulièrement depuis l'Exposition de la Foi, que
votre grandeur a publiée. Ses Enemis qui n'osent
pas se declarer contre Elle, se declarent contre ceux
qui disent la même chose. Et aujourdui Monseig-
neur l'Archevêque de Bourdeaux me fait faire
le Proces, pour avoir expliqué à l'Epargne le jour
de Vendredi Saint, "Que nous adorions Jesus
"Christ crucifié en presence de la Croix, & que
"nous n'adorions rien de ce que nous voyons.
"Et parce que le Curé dit sur le champ assez hant Le
"Bois, Le Bois; j'ajoutai, Non, non, C'est Jesus
"Christ, & non pas le Bois. Et comme il ajouta,
"Ecce Lignum, Venite, Adoremus; je le relevai

V

en

en luy disant, "Auquel le Salut du Monde a été
"attaché. Venez, adorons ce Salut de Monde.

J'ajoutai que le sentiment de l'Eglise étoit, que si
par impossible nous pouvions separer la Divinité du
Fils de Dieu d'avec son humanité, nous n'adorerions
pas l'humanité, puis qu'il est certain qu'il n'y a rien
d'adorable que Dieu; & qu'ainsi nous devions nous
persuader que nous allions au Calvaire adorer Je-
sus Christ, sans nous arreter au Crucifix. Que l'
Eglise, comme une bonne Mere, nous l'avoit donné
par une sainte Invention pour aider à nôtre Foi, &
pour fraper plus vivement nôtre imagination, &
non pour etre l'Objet de nôtre Culte, qui se ter-
mine à Jesus Christ.

Voilà, Monseigneur, tout mon crime, & ce que l'on
me reproche. J'ai écrit au Promoteur & au Vicaire
General, & à Monseigneur l'Archevêque. Je leur
expose, que j'offre à me dedire, si j'ai mal parlé;
j'offre à me justifier. Au prejudice de cela il persiste
dans l'interdiction qu'il lacha verbalement sur le
champ. Je me suis pourvu par apel comme d'abus
au Parlement de Guienne; j'ai fait assigner le Pro-
moteur, & bien que j'ay fait toutes les honnetes
possibles à la Justice Ecclesiastique, & rendu toutes
les deferences, le dit Seigneur Archevêque me menace,
comme ceux qui luy ont rendu ma Lettre me le
mandent, de Prison perpetuelle, & de Fers aux
Pieds.

Vôtre Grandeur peut connoître par ce procedé com-
bien il y a de Personnes qui detournent nos Freres
separés de rentrer dans l'Eglise. L'on m'objecte, ce
que l'on dit contre vôtre livre, que j'adoucis, mais
que le sentiment de l'Eglise est contraire. On
le verra mieux dans le Proces que me sera fait, car
je

je desie mes Enemis de pouvoir faire des reproches contre ma vie & mœurs, & de me reprocher d'autre Doctrine que celle de vôtre Grandeur, que je tache d'exprimer dans les mêmes termes, la trouvant tres conforme aux sentimens de l'Eglise Romaine, & ainsi si je suis convaincu d'Herésie, j'ose dire à vôtre Grandeur qu' elle doit etre à ma Garentie. J'ose pourtant l'assurer, que j'ay assez de lumiere pour bien defendre cette Doctrine, & pour detruire le Preservatif, si l'on ne me fait point de Violence. Je desie tous les Docteurs du Monde de toutes les Religions.

La Grace que je demande à V. G. est que si l'Archevêque se servoit de toute son Autorité pour m'opprimer, qu' Elle daigne interposer la sienne pour m'obtenir la liberté de me defendre. Elle voit combien l'honneur de Dieu y est interessé, dans un tems ou toute la Province est remplie de Missionnaires, de Capucins, & de Jesuites ignorans, qui prechent l'Adoration de la Croix, & la font faire dans une Province ou tout est remplie de Religionnaires, & ou j'ose promettre 10000 Conversions, si la Religion etoit pratiquée conformément à vôtre Exposition. Les Messieurs de la Religion P. R. n'ont autre Objection à me faire si ce n'est que l'Eglise Romaine Vous traite & Me traite d'Heretique. Je demande Pardon à Vôtre Grandeur, Monseigneur, si j'ai crû etre obligé de luy faire connoitre mon Procédé, apres quoi je l'assureray de la Soumission,

De son tres humble
& tres obeissant Serviteur,
IMBERT, Prieur.
V 2 The

The Copy of a Letter sent to Monsieur the Bishop of Meaux, formerly Bishop of Condom.

Port St. Mary, June 13th. 1683.

My Lord,

Your Lordship, without doubt, will better call to mind my Name, when I shall have told you, that I am the Person for whom you had the goodness, about 16 years since, to speak to *Madam de Chaune*, to obtain her consent, as Tutrels to *Monsieur de* — for a certain Chappel; since which I have had the honour to see you several times at *St. Thomas* in the *Louvre*, with my Lords of *Perigueux* and *Xainte*.

Since that I have suffered *Persecution*, and especially since the time that your Lordship has published *your Exposition of the Faith*. Your Enemies, who dare not declare themselves against your Lordship, declare themselves against those who say the same things. And at this instant, the *Archbishop* of *Bordeaux* has caused a Process to be made against me for having explain'd upon *Good-Friday*, "*That we adore JESUS CHRIST crucified in presence of the Cross, and that we do not adore any thing of what we see.*" And forasmuch as the *Curé* replied upon the place aloud, "*The WOOD, the WOOD* ; I added, *No, no, 'tis JESUS CHRIST, and not the WOOD.*" And when he added, *Ecce Lignum, venite, adoremus* ; I took him up, saying, *On which the Saviour of the World hung,*

hang, come let us adore this Saviour of the World.

I said further, that the Doctrine of the Church was, That if by an impossible Supposition we could separate the *Divinity* of the Son of God from his *Humanity*, we should not adore his *Humanity*; forasmuch as 'tis certain, that *there is nothing adorable but God*; and that therefore we ought to think, that we are now going out ~~to~~ ^{to} Mount Calvary to adore JESUS CHRIST, *without stopping at the Crucifix*. That the Church, like a good Mother, had given that to us by a holy Invention, to assist our Faith, and make the livelier Impression upon our Imagination, but not to be the *Object of our Worship*, which must terminate upon JESUS CHRIST.

Behold, my Lord, all my Crime, and what I am reproached with, I have writ to the Promoter, and to the Vicar General, and to the Archbishop himself. I have offered, if I have spoken any thing amiss, that I will recant it: I have offered to justify my self: Notwithstanding all this, his Grace still persists in the verbal Interdict, which he immediately pronounced against me. I have transferr'd my Cause by Appeal, as of Abuse, to the Parliament of Guienne: I have caused the Proctor to be summon'd; and though I have used all imaginable fairness, with reference to the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, paid them all possible deference, nevertheless the said Archbishop threatens me, as I am informed by those who gave him my Letter, with perpetual Imprisonment and Chains, for my Offence.

Your Lordship may see by this Proceeding, how many there are that hinder our separating Brethren from returning to our Communion. They object to me, that which is also said against your Lordship's Book,

Book,

Book, That I do *mollifie*, but that the *Doctrine* of the Church is quite the contrary. This will more plainly appear by the Process against me; for I defie my Enemies to reproach me for my Life and Manners, or for any other *Doctrin*e than that of your Lordship, which I endeavour to expresse in the self same Terms, as finding them most agreeable to the Sentiments of the Roman Church: so that if I am convicted of Heresie, I am bold to say, your Lordship must be my Surety. But I dare assure you, my Lord, that I have Knowledge enough to defend this *Doctrin*e, and destroy the * *Preservative*, might I be but secure from Violence: I defie all the Doctors of the World, of whatsoever Religion they be,

* An Answer
to Monsieur de
Maucci's Expo-
sition, intituled,
Preservatif contre le
changement de
Religion.

The Favour which I have to beg of your Lordship, is, That if the Archbishop should make use of his Authority to oppress me, you will please to interpose yours so far, as to procure me only the Liberty to defend my self. You see how far the Honour of God is concerned in it, and especially at a time when the whole Province is filled with *Missionaries*, *Capuchins*, ignorant *Jesuits*, and others, who preach up the Adoration of the Cross, and cause it to be done in a Country full of Protestants, and among whom I durst promise 10000 Converts, were the Practice of our Religion conformable to your Exposition. The Protestants have hardly any other Objection to make to me, than this, That the Church of Rome treats both your Lordship and me as Hereticks.

I beg your Lordship's Pardon for this; I thought my self obliged to acquaint you with my Case; after which, I have only remaining to assure you of the Submission of,

My LORD,

Your Lordship's most humble and obedient Servant,

IMBERT.

Such

Such was the Account which *Monsieur Imbert* gave of his *Case* to *M. de Meaux*; I was the more willing to publish it, that those who have never seen the *Factum* which he printed of it, and which is ^{42 pages in 4to.} too long to be inserted here, may at least by this perceive that his Crime was truly his adhering to *M. de Meaux's Exposition*; and that he had reason to say, as he does in this Letter to him, *That if he was convicted of Heresie, M. de Meaux ought to be his warrant for it.*

And because the Bishop has been pleased to endeavour to take off the force of this great *Allegation*, by lessening the *Character of the Person*, I shall leave it to the indifferent Reader to judge, whether this Letter carries any thing of the Stile of an *extravagant, a man of no learning, as well as of no Reputation*, such as *M. de Meaux* in his *Answer* pretends him to be.

Vindicat. p. 116. Cet Imbert est un homme sans sçavoir, qui crût justifier ses extravagances en nommant mon Exposition, &c.

NUM. V.

The Epistle of St. Chrysostome to Cæsarius, cut by some of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, out of the Greek Edition of Palladius, published by Monsieur Bigot, 1680. with a Dissertation premised, containing an Historical Account of the whole Affair.

IT will perhaps be look'd upon by some, as a little unseasonable, to joyn a piece of *Antiquity* so considerable as this *Epistle*, to a Treatise of so little Importance

Importance as the foregoing Defence may justly be esteem'd to be. But since the main thing I charge *M. de Meaux* with, is, That a first *Edition* of his Book was *suppres'd* for containing some Assertions not so suitable to the Sentiments of the *Sorbonne Doctors*, to whom it was sent for their *Approbation*, to shew the undistinguishing Justice of their Proceedings, and that *M. de Meaux* is not the only *Bishop* they have dealt thus rudely with on these Occasions; I was willing to communicate to the World one Instance more of the like nature, especially since the Original Leaves, ras'd out, and suppress'd by them, have here also fallen into my Hands, and may at any time be seen with the suppress'd *Edition* of *M. de Meaux's Exposition*.

It may be some Satisfaction to *M. de Meaux* to consider, that in this Case, he has run no other fortune than what is common to him with the great *St. Chrysostome*: And possibly the Reader too will from hence begin to find it no difficult matter to believe, that those who made no scruple to suppress a whole *Epistle* of *St. Chrysostome*, a *Patriarch* and a *Saint*, for contradicting their *Doctrine* in one only *Point*, may indeed have made as little of correcting *M. de Meaux's Exposition*, tho' a *Bishop's*, that had prevaricated their *Faith* in so many.

Nor was I less engaged on the *Vindicator's* account to this Publication; 'tis one of his greatest difficulties, and which he seems the most desirous to be resolv'd in, how there can be such a thing as the *Real Presence* in the *Eucharist*, without *Transubstantiation*? I have before told him what I suppose sufficient to explain this matter. But because I cannot expect that either my *Church* or *Book* should pass with

pass with him for an *Oracle*, it may be some confirmation of the *Idea* to shew him one of their pretended *Patrons* concurring with me in the *Exposition*, and manifestly supposing a Union betwixt the *Bread* and *Christ's Body* in the holy *Eucharist*, and yet stily contending at the same time, that the *Nature* of the *Bread* is not *changed* in it.

All the danger is, that this holy Father, who, as Monsieur * *Bigot* observes, has hitherto pass'd for * See Mr *Bigot's* Preface below. the great *Doctor* of the *Eucharist*, as *St. Austin* of *Grace*, may possibly by this run the hazard of losing his Credit amongst them; and as it has fared but very lately with *Theodoret* upon the *same account*, that they will henceforth begin to *lessen his Reputation*, since they cannot any longer *suppress his Doctrine*.

But before I offer the *Epistle* it self, it is fit that I premise something for the better understanding of it. It was written to *Cæsarius*, a *Monk*, that had a little before fallen into the *Apollinarian Heresie*, to reduce him to the *Catholick Faith*. I shall therefore beg leave to begin my *Reflections* with a short account of that, as far as may serve to open the way to what we are to read of it in this.

REFLECTION I.

Of APOLLINARIUS and his HERESIE.

A POLLINARIUS the younger, from whom this *Heresie* derives its name, was Son
X to

Godefroy vie
de S. Athanase,
livre II. cap.
13. Ex Basil.
Ep 74.

Socrat. Ecclef.
Hist. lib. 3.
cap 16.
Calvisii Chro-
nol. pag. 525.
an. 362.

to the elder *Apollinaris*, a very learned Man, and never, that we read of, charged with any *Heresie*. He was of *Alexandria*, where he was ordain'd a *Priest*, and became deservedly eminent for this, That when *Julian* forbad the Christians the reading of human Writers, being envious of that Reputation which many of the *Fathers* of the *Church* had so justly acquired in that sort of Learning; he with his Son, repaired in great measure this Disadvantage, by opening of two *Schools*: The *Father* turning the Writings of the *Old Testament* into *Heroick Verse*, and composing several *Tragedies* of the *Historical Parts* of them: The *Son* explaining the *New* in *Dialogues*, after the *Platonick* manner; and by this means preserving the *Church* from that Ignorance, which the *Apostate* Emperor thought to have reduced it to.

Sozomen. Eccl.
Hist. lib. 6.
c. 25.
See Epiphan.
Hær. 77. Theo-
philus l. 1. pas-
chal. Vincen.
Lirin. lib. adv.
prof. novatio-
nes. Quid illo
præstantius
acumine, ex-
ercitatione,

doctrinâ? Quam multas ille Hæreses multis voluminibus oppresserit, quot inimicos fidei confutaverit errores, indicio est opus illud 30 non minus librorum, nobilissimum & maximum, quo insanas Porphyrii calumnias, magnâ probationum mole confudit. Longum est universa ipsius opera commemorare, quibus profectò summis Aëdificatoribus Ecclesiæ par esse potuisset, nisi profanâ illâ hæreticæ curiositatis libidine, novum nescio quod adinvenisset, quo & cunctos labores suos, velut cujusdam lepræ admixtione, scedaret, & committeret, ut doctrina ejus non tam ædificatio, quam tentatio potius ecclesiastica dile-

lect.

left of him, had he not fallen into *Heresie*, he
 “ might justly have been equall’d to the chiefest Builders
 “ of the Church.

III. The *Occasion* of his *Heresie* is diversely reported by Ecclesiastical Writers. * *Ruffinus* tells us, * *Ruffin. lib. 2. cap. 20.* that his extraordinary Facility to write upon all sorts of Subjects, and his great Understanding in all kinds of Learning, rais’d in him a love of Disputation; and that the desire of refuting whatever others said, made him at last himself become a Heretick. † *Sozomen* relates, that St. *Athanasius* in his Passage through *Laodicea*, where *Apollinarius* then was, contracted so intimate a Friendship with him, that *George*, Bishop of that place, and who detested the Communion of St. *Athanasius*, as the other *Arrians* did, excommunicated || *Apollinarius* || *Petavius* saies it was for keeping too much company with the Heathen *Euphanus*. See dogm. Theol. T. 4. l. 1. p. 25. c. 6. * *Theodoret*: Eccles. Hist. l. 5 c. 4. upon this account, and would never be perswaded to receive him, whatever Instances he could make to that purpose; and that upon this he conceived so great a discontent, that it carried him in the end to form himself a new *Heresie*. And lastly, * *Theodoret* differing from both these, tells us, That being rejected from the Government of the Church, to which in the Contest between *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, he also, as Head of a third Party, aspired; he thereupon began to spread openly that *Heresie* he had before invented, and to set himself up for chief of it.

IV. Whether any, or all these Causes concurr’d to ruine one of the greatest Ornaments of the Church, and who had till then been the Admiration of the best Men, not only St. *Athanasius*, *Basil*, &c. who were his Friends, but all the others, as many as have left us any account of the History of

those times, having constantly represented him in the most advantageous manner that could be expected: Certain it is, that his loss was a very sensible Blow to the Church, and is as such, exceedingly lamented by *Epiphanius* in the account of his *Herese*.

Epiphani. Hæc.
77.

* *Godefroy* places it *An. 361.*
See *Balf.*
Zon. com. in
Can. 1. Concil.
O. c. secundi.

V. He had now been some time made * *Bishop* of *Laodicea*; whether of the great *Laodicea* in *Syria*, or of the other in *Phœnicia* of *Libanus*, is not certainly known. It was not long after this Promotion that he became a *Heretick*. *Athanasius*, who died within 10 years after, having written a long Letter to *Epictetus*, Bishop of *Corinth*, against his Errors; tho' either his respect to a Person he had so much esteem'd, or being unwilling to exasperate One, whom he so earnestly desired to reduce to the *Catholick Faith*, made him that he did not once name him in his whole *Epistle*.

See this Letter
in *Epiphani.*
Hæc. 77.

VI. But we will come yet nearer; for in the year 362. *Athanasius* being the third time return'd from Banishment, held a Council at *Alexandria*; in which, among other things, we find the *Herese* of *Apollinarius* expressly condemned, tho' no mention made of his Name; whether it were that he was not yet known as chief of those *Hereticks*, or that, as some think, he sent a Renuntiation of his *Herese* to the Council by the Monks that went thither. About ten years after, Anno 373. the same *Herese* was again condemned in another Council at *Rome*, under Pope *Damasus*; and lastly, in the second General Council at *Constantinople*, Anno 381. He is by name *anathematized* among the other *Hereticks*, Can. 1. of that Synod.

See this Council in *Labbe's*
Collection,
T. 2. p. 816.

Vid. Binnij not.
loc. cit.

VII. As to the *Hereſie* it ſelf, I ſhall not enter any farther into the ſearch of it, than may ſerve for the Explication of that Capital Error, which gave Occaſion to this *Epiftle* of *St. Chryſoſtome*. Now this, to take it in his own words as they are reported by *Photius* from *Eulogius*, was, That *θεός & σὰρξ μίαν ἀπετέλεσαν φύσιν*, That God and fleſh make up but one Nature, which *Balſamon* and *Zonaras* thus explain, "Ελεγε γὰρ ὁ υἱὸν τῆς θεᾶς, σῶμα ἑμψυχον ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας δυνάμεως ἀναλαβεῖν, ἄνθρωπον δὲ, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἀρχαίας ἀντὶ τοῦς. That he ſaid, that the Son of God took indeed an *animate Body* of the bleſſed Virgin, but without the *Rational Soul*, the *Divinity* ſerving inſtead of *that*.

Photii bibl. in Eulogio p. 850.

Comment. in Conc. 2. Oecumen. can. 1.

VIII. And the ſame is the account which the other Eccleſiaſtical Writers have left of him; *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Theodoret*, *Epiphanius*, *Theodoranus*, &c. all which unanimouſly agree in this point of his aſſerting, ἑμψυχον μὲν εἶναι τὴν σαρκα, τοῦ σώματος, ἢ μὴ τῷ λογικῷ ἐκκεῖναι ψυχῇ, θεοῦ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν, τὴν δὲ θεοῦ λόγον παρὲν. That the *Body* of our *Saviour* was *animated*, but that he had not the *Rational Soul*; for that that *Soul* was ſuperfluous, where the *Divine λόγος*, or *Word* was preſent.

Theodoret. Hæref. Fabul. l. 5. c. 11.

IX. But tho' this were the laſt Reſolution of his *Hereſie* as to this point, yet was it not his firſt Error. It was a part of the Doctrin maintained by *Arrius* and *Eunomius*, That *Chriſt* took a *Body* deſtitute not only of the *Rational Soul*, but altogether *inanimate*; σῶμα μόνον ἀνειληφέναι, ſaies *Theodoret*, ὁ θεὸς λόγον, ὡς τὸν ὃς τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν τῷ σώματι πληροῦσαι τῷ χρεῖαν. That God the *Word* took a *meer Body*, and that himſelf ſupplied the want of the *Soul*. And the ſame was the beginning of *Apollinarius's Hereſie*.

Theodoret. Hæref. Fabul. l. 4. c. 1. & Epift. 104. de Arrio & Eunomio.

Socrates Hist.
Eccl. l. 2. c. 46.

refie too. Πρώτῳ μὲν ἔλεγον. φαίης Socrates, ἀνα-
ληφθῆναι τὸ ἀνθρώπου πρὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκονομίᾳ
τῇ ἐνδρωθῆναι ψυχῇ ἀνδ' εἶτα ὡς ἐκ ματαιότητος ὁπ-
διορθεύμενοι, πρὸς θεόν, ψυχῇ μὲν ἀνελήφθαι, νῦν δ'
ἐκ ἔχειν αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' εἴ τὸ θεὸν λόγον ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς τὴν
ἀναληφθῆναι ἀνθρώπου. They first asserted, That
God at his Incarnation took upon him Man without
any Soul. Afterwards, as if they repented, and meant
to correct their Error, they held, That he took in-
deed the animal Soul, but was destitute of the Ratio-
nal, God the Word being instead of that. Both which
Vincentius Lirinensis tells us, they sometimes joyn-
ed together, saying, In ipsa Salvatoris nostri carne,
aut animam humanam penitus non fuisse, aut certe
talem fuisse cui mens & ratio non esset; That in the
Body of our Saviour there was either no Human
Soul at all, or at least such as was not rational.

Vincent. Liri-
nens. adv. Hæ-
ret. c. 17.

X. I shall not now enter on any other Points of
their Heresie, such as their making this Flesh not to
have been assum'd by Christ at his Conception, but to
have been always with him consubstantial with the
Divinity; which Divinity therefore by consequence suf-
fer'd, and was mortal; which Epiphanius, Theodoret,
but especially Gregor. Nazianzen has at large re-
lated. Only since, some, for the more distinct con-
ception of the Apollinarian Heresie, have thus dis-
tinguish'd it from that of Eutyches afterwards;
that the Eutychian affirm'd, That our blessed Savi-
our took nothing from the blessed Virgin, but that
the very Logos, the Word it self being, as Theodoret
expresses it, immutably converted, and made Flesh,

Epiphani. Hæ-
ret. 77.
Theodoret. Ec-
cles. Hist. l. 5.
cap. 3.
Greg. Naz. O-
rat. 46. p. 722.
c. 7c.

Theodoret. Hæ-
retic. Fab. l. 4.
c. 13. Οὐδὲν
ἕτερον, Eutyches,

ἡ δὲ ἐν λόγον ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκ τῆς παρθένου λαβεῖν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν ἀτρέπτως κρατῆναι, καὶ σάρκα
γίνεσθαι, τῷ πνεύματι μόνῳ διὰ τῆς παρθένου ποιῆσαι.

only

only passed through the Virgin; whereas Apollinarius supposed the *Flesh* of *Christ*, which he took of the *Virgin*, to be converted into the *Divine Nature*: It appears by *Gregory Nazianzen*, that this was no certain distinction, forasmuch as the *Apollinarian* too affirmed oftentimes the same thing; that, as the *Father* expresses it in the place I before cited, our *Saviour* was even before he descended, the *Son of Man*, and descending, brought his *Flesh* along with him, which he had whilst he was in *Heaven*, before all *Ages*, and consubstantial with his *Essence*. Which is what *Theodore* long since observed, when in his 3. Dialogue, speaking with relation to them both, he says, οἱ τὴν ποικίλῳ ταύτῳ σωπιδεύοντες ἃ πο-
 λύμορφον αἰρέσειν, ποτὲ μὲν σάρκα γενήσθαι τὸ θεῖον λόγον φασί, ποτὲ δὲ τὴν σάρκα λέγουσι τὸ εἰς θεότητα φύσιν δε-
 δέχσθαι μετέβολῶν. They who have patcht together this various and many-form'd *Heretic*, sometimes say, that the *Word* is become *Flesh*, sometimes that the *Flesh* is changed into the *Word*.

Wherefore laying aside these subtleties, this we may undoubtedly conclude, That whatever their other differences were, whether as to his *Body*, which we see is uncertain, or to his *Soul*, in which the variety was more constant and more discernable; the *Eutychian* affirming the *Union* of the two intire *Natures*, the *Humane* and *Divine*; whereas the *Apollinarian* deny'd that our *Saviour* ever assumed the reasonable *Soul* at all: certain it is, for what concerns our present purpose, that they both agreed in this, That after the *Union* of the *Word* and *Flesh*, there was but one only *Nature* common to both, the *Substance* of the two, that were before, being now confus'd and permixt; from whence they were

Naz. orat. 46.
 supr. dist. Δι-
 αβεβαιῶται,
 Apollinarius,
 πρὶν τὴν κα-
 ταβῆναι, αὐ-
 τὸν υἱὸν ἀν-
 θρώπου εἶναι,
 καὶ κατὰ τὴν
 ἰδίαν ἐπαρά-
 μων σαρκὸς
 ἐκείνου, ἢν
 ἐν τοῖς ἑσχατοῖς
 ἔχων ἐν γ-
 γῶν, πρὸς
 αὐτὸν πρὸς καὶ
 σωμαστικῶν.
 Pag. 722.

See Petav.
 Dogm. Theolog.
 Tom. 4. l. 1.
 c. 15. pag. 71.
 §. 3.

† *Apollinarius* were both of them afterwards called by † *St. Chry-*
 by *St. Chryso-* *stom* and others *Cumencasai*, from their confusion of
stom, Eutyches the two Natures into one, and making not only
 by others. one Person, as the *Catholick Church* did, but one
 Nature too alone in *Christ*.

REFLECTION II.

St. Chrysostome's Argument from the Eucharist
against the Apollinarians, consider'd and
explain'd.

SUCH is the Account which the antient Fathers
 have left us of the *Apollinarian* Heresie, and
 the same we find to have been the Notion which
St. J. Chrysostom in this *Epistle* had of it. He
 “proves the *divine* and *humane* Natures to be distinct
 “in *Christ*; that the *Properties* of the one, ought no
 “otherwise to be confounded with the other, than as
 “they are united in the same Person. He charges
 “the *Apollinarians* with saying that our Saviour's Body
 “is converted into the *Divinity*, and upon that ac-
 “count attributing *Passion* to the *Deity*: and finally,
 he concludes all with this *Exhortation* to *Casarius*,
 whom he designed by this *Epistle* to recover from
 their *Errours*. “Wherefore, dearly beloved, says
 “he, laying aside the novel Phrases, and vain Speeches
 “of these men, let us return to what we have before
 “said; that it is pious, most pious indeed, that we
 “should confess our Saviour *Christ*, who died for us,
 “to be perfect in the *Godhead*, perfect in the *Man-*
 “hood; one only begotten Son, not divided into two,
 “but

“ *but bearing in himself together the unmixt proprieties of two distinct Natures. Not two different Persons, God forbid ! But one and the same Lord Jesus, God, Word ; cloathed with our Fleſh, and that not inanimate, without the rational Soul, as the wicked Apollinarius pretends. Let us then aſſent to theſe things, let us fly thoſe who would divide him ; for though the Natures be diſtinct, yet is there but one undivided and indiviſible Union to be acknowledged in the ſame one Perſon and Subſtance of the Son.*

II. And now if this be the *Catholick Doctrin*e which this Holy Father here deſigns to bring *Cæſarius* to ; ſuch the *Errours*, which by the ſubtlety of the *Apollinarians* he was involved in : It will be very eaſie to conceive the *Alluſion* he here makes between the *two Natures* united in *Chriſt*, and the *two Parts*, which the *Catholick Church* has ever acknowledged in the *Holy Eucharift* ; to the deſtruction of the *Romaniſts* Pretences of *Transubſtantiation*, and to the ſolid Eſtabliſhment of the real Preſence of *Chriſt* in this ſacred *Mystery*, ſuch as the *Church of England* believes, and has been eſtabliſhed by me in the foregoing Diſcourſe.

III. The Words of *St. Chryſoſtome* in this *Epistle* See below. are theſe : “ *Chriſt* is both *GOD* and *MAN* ; *GOD*, “ *in that he is impaſſible* ; *MAN*, *for that he ſuffer’d*. “ *yet but one SON, one LORD ; He the ſame without* “ *doubt, having one Dominion, one Power of two uni-* “ *ted Natures. Not that theſe Natures are conſub-* “ *ſtantial, forasmuch as either of them, does without* “ *confuſion retain its own Properties, and being two,* “ *are yet inconfuſed in him.*

“ *For as [in the Eucharift] before the BREAD*

Y

“ *is*

" is Consecrated, we call it *BREAD*, but when the
 " Grace of God by the Priest has consecrated it, it is
 " no longer called *BREAD*, but is esteemed wor-
 " thy to be called the *LORD's BODY*, although
 " the Nature of *BREAD* still remains in it; and
 " we do not say there be *TWO BODIES*, but *ONE*
 " *BODY* of the Son: So here, the *DIVINE NATURE*
 " being joyned with the [*Humane*] *BODY*, they both
 " together make up but one Son, one Person. But yet
 " they must be confess'd to remain without confusion,
 " after an indivisible manner, not in *ONE NATURE*,
 " but in *TWO PERFECT NATURES*.

IV. In which Passage, whether we consider the Expressions themselves, or the Application of them, they are utterly destructive of Transubstantiation.

First, as to the Expressions themselves.

They tell us plainly, " That the Nature of
 " *BREAD* remains in the Eucharist after the Con-
 " secration: That our not calling it *BREAD*, but
 " *CHRIST's BODY*, does not therefore intend to signi-
 " fie that the Nature of *BREAD* is at all chang-
 " ed; for that the *BREAD* by Consecration becomes
 " indeed worthy to be CALLED THE *LORD's*
 " *BODY*, but yet still retains its own Nature of
 " *BREAD*.

V. These are such plain expressions of the Bread's continuing in its own Nature after Consecration, that the Papists themselves have not been

* See most of able to deny it. So that their only Refuge is, that these cited by by the *BREAD's* retaining still its own Nature, Albertinus, de we are, they say, to understand only this, that its Eucharist. l. 2. pag. 533. in Accidents remain, but for its Substance, that is Chrysostomo, changed into the *BODY OF CHRIST*. * Thus c. l. Gardi-

Gardiner, Turrian, Bellarmine, Gregory de Valentia, Vasquez, Snares, Perron, Gamacheus, and last of all, Father † Nouet, in his Controversie against † Nouet de la
 Monsieur Claude. presence de
 Jesus Christ
 dans les
 tres saint Sa-
 crement, liv.
 4. c. 5. art. 3
 p. 285.

VI. This is indeed to cut the Knot when it was not to be untied; and makes St. Chrysostome in effect to say thus much, *That the Nature of BREAD after the Consecration, still remains, though indeed the Nature be changed, and only the Accidents continue.* And would it not have been an admirable Similitude, to shew that the Humane Nature of Christ was *not* changed into the Divine, as the Apollinarian pretended, to alledge the Example of the Eucharist, in which the Nature of the BREAD was *changed* into the very Nature of Christ's Body, as the Papists believe.

VII. But S. Chrysostome was not so absurd, as these men would represent him; and his other Expressions utterly overthrow this Evasion. 1. He tells us plainly, that all the Change that was made in the BREAD by Consecration, was in the Name, not the Substance: That whereas before it was called BREAD, by being consecrated it became worthy to be CALLED THE LORD'S BODY. 2. Had St. Chrysostome believed the BREAD to have been truly changed, and become the very Body of Christ, would he have said that it became WORTHY to be CALLED the Body of Christ? and not rather plainly have told us that it *became* the VERY BODY of Christ? Do men use to say that the Heaven is *worthy* to be called the Heaven? The Sun, *worthy* to be called the Sun? And why shall we think St. Chrysostome the only ridiculous man, to use such a Phrase as no man in the World ever did, or would have done

See this Argument managed by
 Monsieur
 Claude, Rep. à
 Pere Nouet.
 Partie 5. c. 6.
 p. 488.

besides? But 3. And to put this point beyond all doubt: When St. *Chrysostome* here speaks of the *Nature* of *BREAD*, in allusion to the *Nature* of *CHRIST*; if we will have him consistent with himself, we must suppose him to have used that *Expression* with reference to both, in the same sense. As therefore in his Discourse immediately before and after, by *Nature*, with reference to *CHRIST*, he does not mean the *Properties* only, but the very *Substance* of his *Humanity* and *Divinity*; so here in his allusion to the *Eucharistical BREAD*, he must still mean the same, the *Substance* of the *BREAD*, and not barely the *Properties*, or *Accidents* of it; and of this I am persuaded no indifferent Person will make any doubt.

Secondly, As to the *design* of this *Allusion*,

VIII. The *Apollinarians*, as we have seen, affirm'd the *Change* of one *Nature* in *Christ* into the other; That however, before the *Union*, they were two distinct things, yet by being united, the humane *Nature* became converted, or if you will, *transubstantiated* into the *Divine*.

IX. Now the Falseness of this S. *Chrysostom*, shews by the Example of the *Eucharist*. That as there the *BREAD* by being consecrated becomes indeed worthy to be called *CHRIST's BODY*, yet do's not lose its own *Nature*, but continues the same *BREAD*, as to its *Substance*, that it was before: So here, the *Humane Nature* of *Christ*, being by the *Incarnation* hypostatically united to the *Divine*, did not cease to be a *Humane Nature*, but still continued what it was before, however united with the other in one Person.

X. So

X. So that as certainly then as the *Humane Nature* of *Christ* does now continue to be a *Humane Nature*, notwithstanding that *Incarnation*; so certainly does the *BREAD* in the Eucharist continue *BREAD* after this *Consecration*. As certainly as *Apollinaris* was deceived in supposing the *Manhood* of *Christ* to be swallowed up and changed into the *Godhead*; so certainly is the *Papist* deceived in imagining the *Substance* of the *BREAD* to be swallow'd up and converted into the *Substance* of *CHRIST'S BODY*, in this *Holy Sacrament*.

XI. *Christ's Humane Nature* being united to the *Divine*, became worthy thereby to be called, together with it, by the same common Name of *Christ*, *Lord*, *Jesus*, the *Word*, the *Son of God*; the *BREAD* being by *Consecration* mystically united to *Christ's BODY*, becomes worthy to be called, together with it, *THE LORD'S BODY*; but that is all, the *Humane Nature* still continues what it was before; in the *one*, the *Nature* of the *BREAD* still continues what it was before in the *other*, and there is no *Transubstantiation* made in either.

XII. In a word, in the *Hypostatick Union*, though there be two distinct *Natures*, *God* and *Man*, yet there is but *one Person*, *one Son* made up of both. So in the *Holy Eucharist*, though there be two different things united, the *BREAD* and *CHRIST'S BODY*, yet we do not say there be *two Bodies*, but *one mystical Body* of *Christ*, made up of both; as the *King* and his *Image*, to use the Similitude of the *Antient Fathers*, are not *two*, but *one King*: Or in the Example of *St. Chrysostome* himself, *Christ* and the *Church*, are not *two*, but *one Body*.

REFLECTION III.

Of the Epistle it self, and the Attempts that have been made against it.

I. **A**Nd now when such is the force of this *Epistle*, that it utterly destroys one of the principal *Errors of Popery*: It is not at all to be wondred at, if those men who were resolved not to be convinced by it themselves, have used all imaginable means to provide that others should not.

Ann. 1548.

II. It is now above 100 years, since this passage was first produced by *Peter Martyr*, in his Dispute with *Gardiner*, *Bishop of Winchester*, concerning the *Eucharist*. He then profess'd that he had copied it out of the *Florentine MS.* and that the whole *Epistle* was put by him into *Arch-Bishop Cranmer's Library*.

II Lovanii
Confutatio Ca-
villationum,
Sec ad Obj.
201.

|| This *Gardiner* could not deny, who therefore in his Answer to him 1552. endeavour'd first to ascribe it to another *John of Constantinople*, who lived about the beginning of the 6th Century. Secondly, to elude the force of this Passage, by that strange interpretation of the Word *Nature*, I have before mentioned, and in which all the others have since follow'd him.

† Libr. 1. de
Euchar. cap. 18.

III. † *Turrian*, who by his writing seems to shew that he had somewhere or other seen this *Epistle*, contends in like manner, and if we may believe *Vasquez*, and *de Valentia*, proves it too, that this *Epistle* was not *Chrysostom's*, but the other *John's*, to whom the *Bishop of Winchester* had before

Vasquez dif.
180. c. 9. n. 102.
Valentia de
Transub. cap. 7.
§. *Similiter.*

before ascribed it. But yet still the Argument recurr'd upon them, forasmuch as this other *John* was in the beginning of the 6th Age, and *Transubstantiation* by consequence was not the *Doctrine* of the *Church* then.

IV. And indeed *Garnachans* is not very unwilling to acknowledge this: for having with the rest assigned this *Epistle* to the other *John*, he tells us, he is to be excused, for that *Transubstantiation* was not so plainly delivered and explain'd in those days as it is now.

V. But this * *Cardinal Perron* could not bear, he neither thought fit to rely upon an *Evasion*, which he saw would not do their business, nor could he endure to allow so antient an Author as either of the two *Johns*, to have been so directly opposite to their Sentiments in this matter. And therefore flatly accuses *Peter Martyr* of *Forgery*, and uses a bundance of Arguments to perswade the World, that there was never any such *Epistle* as had been pretended.

VI. Thus stood this Passage, and the whole *Epistle* for its sake; till about six years since the learned *Bigotius*, who had twelve years before brought a *Copy* of it from *Florence*, resolved to ruine all the Endeavours of these Men, by publishing the very *Epistle*, which the *Cardinal* had so loudly proclaimed to be a *Forgery*, and proving it to be indeed the *Genuine Off-Spring* of *St. Chrysostome*, contrary to what the rest had in vain pretended.

VII. And this he accordingly, with great sincerity performed, *Ann.* 1680. For in his *Edition* of *Palladius* that year, among the other Pieces which he added to it, this *Epistle* of *St. Chrysostome* had

one

Excusari posse, quod nec Transubstantiatio ejus temporibus ita perspicue

tradita & explicata fuerat, sicut hodie.

See Albertinus de Euch. p. 533. l. 2. supr. cit.

* *Perron de l'Eucharistie. p. 381, 382, 383.*

one of the first places, and was strengthened by him with such *Attestations*, as shew it to be beyond all doubt *authentick*. In his *Preface* he declared how he came by it, and made a short *Apology* for that passage of it that had caused so great a Contest; but such as it seems, he was either conscious to himself, not to have been very strong, or fear'd at least that his *Censors* would not esteem it to be so.

Expostulatio.
pag. iii.

VIII. And in this I speak no more than what he himself declared to his Friends, insomuch that he resolved to reserve privately some few Copies, for fear the rest should run that risque, which indeed they accordingly did. For being now quite finish'd, and just ready to come abroad, some of the *Doctors* of the *Sorbonne*, whereof *Monsieur Grandin* and *Mr. Faure* have been charged as the Principal, caused it to be *suppressed*, and the *printed Leaves* cut out of the *Book*, without any thing to supply the place of them.

S. Anastasii
in Hexaëme-
ron lib. 12.
Cui præmissa
est expostulatio
&c. Lond.
1682. 4^{to}.

IX. And of this the Edition of *Palladius* of that year remains a standing Monument, both in the *Preface*, and in the *Book*; and it was publicly complain'd of by a very learned Man, in an *Expostulation* prefixed to a piece of *Anastasius*, publish'd by him about two years after.

X. But what that Reverend Person could not then obtain, being since fallen into my hands, I mean the *very Leaves cut out by these Doctors*, of *Mr. Bigot's Preface*, and the *Epistle rased out of the Book*; I was unwilling to come into a Part of their Fraud, by detaining any longer that, which both so well deserved, and had so long since been prepared for a publick view.

XI. I hope

XI. I hope the learned World, whom I principally design to gratifie in this matter, will accept this never the worse, for that *Mr. le Moyne* the last year published this Epistle among his *Varia Sacra*: That learned Man having neither given *Tom. 1.* the *Greek Fragments*, which I now publish from *Monsieur Bigots* own *Impression*; nor *Monsieur Bigots* account of it, in the part of the *Preface* which was *suppressed*. Not to add, that the *Latine Copy* of *Mr. le Moyne* is so very false, that it renders the *Epistle* utterly unintelligible. I do not pretend to anticipate his design, which he appears so jealous of: that is too *vast* to be injured by any thing I can offer; and I shall be glad if what I now publish may be any way serviceable to it.

XII. As to the *Authority* of this Piece, I shall need say no more than what *Monsieur Bigot* has already done to prove it to be *Genuine*. So many ancient *Authors* have cited it, as *St. Chrysostom's Epistle to Casarius*; such *Fragments* of it remain in the most antient Writers as *Authentick*, that he who after all these shall call this Piece in question, may with the same reasonableness doubt of all the rest of his works, which, perhaps upon less grounds, are on all sides allow'd as true and undoubted.

But it is time now to see what account *Monsieur Bigot* himself gives of it.

Suppressa in Præfatione Emerici Bigotii, de
Epistolâ Chrysostomi ad Cæsarium, Mona-
chum.

Præfat. lit. i, ij.
pag. prior.
inter lin. 22,
& 23.

* Lit. i, ij. pag.
altera.

Hanc Orationem sequitur Epistola ad Cæsarium, Monachum, quæ licet nitore suo nativo, id est, Græco eloquio, destituta, nihilominus sub velo veteris Latine Interpretationis mirifico eloquentiæ disertissimi doctoris radios exhibet. Primus qui ultimis temporibus hujus meminit Epistola, fuit Petrus Martyr, Florentinus; qui ex eâ locum quendam protulit in locis communibus. Insolitus loquendi de EUCHARISTIA modus, qui ex eâ referebatur, à Johannis Chrysostomi phra-
si * ac genio prorsus alienus lectores in diversa traxit sententias. Aliis supposititiam esse affirmantibus, aliis pro virili contendentibus, veram esse ac genuinam; omnes integram videre summe concupiscere; dolueruntque Petrum Martyrem, qui primus de eâ mentionem injecerat, minime indicasse qua in Bibliotheca extaret codex MS, Florentiæ delitescere omnium erat suspicio, quia Florentinus fuit Petrus Martyr, sed ubi, ab omnibus nesciebatur. Mihi quæ fortuna faverat in reperiendo contextu Græco vitæ St. Johannis Chrysostomi, hic etiam non defuit. Ejus exemplar reperi apud R. R. P. P. Dominicanos, in monasterio S. Marci. Cujus te in partem equalis venire libens patior; nec expecto ut mihi succlames in commune, nonis equalis, si modo exorari te sinas, ut benignâ interpretatione emollias, quæ durinscule sonant de Eucharistiæ Sacramento, & in memoriam revoces tot & tam insignes locos, in quibus adeo luculenter de hoc sacro-sancto Mysterio loquitur Joannes noster, ut Doctor
En-

Eucharistia vocari meruerit, sicut S. Augustinus Doctor Gratia vulgò predicatur. Dixi Petrum Martyrem primum postremis temporibus hujus Epistole meminisse, qua antea Gracis Patribus notissima fuerat, utpote qui multa testimonia ex ea adversus Monophysitas & Acephalos adduxerunt, ut observare licet in Notis, quas margini apposui, indicando codices ex quibus Textum Gracum apud illos patres à me inventum descripsi. Caterum ubi deficiebant verba Graca, vacua Columnarum spatia reliqui, nec passus sum ea punctis, aut lineolis, sicut librariorum mos est, repleri, ut possint inibi viri eruditi verba Graca adscribere * si-
 quando ea invenerint. Cum enim experimento noverim, quo casu, quâve fortunâ in ea quæ attexui testimonia, inciderim, non despero ab aliis alia posse inveniri. Quisque experiatur cui fortuna erit faventior; & sicui ea obsecundaverit, is ne publico invideat, neq; apud se inventa privatim detineat. Qui veteres libros tractant, norunt nullam veteris cujuscunque libri editionem, quæ ex unico exemplari fuerit eruta, hucusque produisse, omni ex parte perfectam. Mannu exarati codices mutuas aliorum exposcunt operas, ut quod in uno corruptum est, ab alio sanetur; quod in uno vetustas oblitteraverit, ab alio lucem accipiat. Hoc verum esse de codice hujus Epistole fateri cogor, qui licet annorum sit 500, parum tamen emendatè scriptus est, & opem à Graco præcipuè codice, aut ab alio saltem Latino, postulat. In eo quem vidi, aliquando voces continuae sunt, aliquando simplex vocalis E pro diphthongo Æ scripta fuit; I pro D, & vice versa D pro I; verbis aliquando ita corruptis, ut ad sanitatem reduci minime possint absque subsidio aliorum codicum. Quæ scribarum incuria deterruit, opinor, Petrum Martyrem ab eâ edendâ. Taceo interpreta-
 tionem,

* Lit. i. iij.

tionem, quæ minus accurata, imo planè barbara videtur. Ego his omnibus nævis Lectores benevolos nequaquam offensum iri arbitratus sum; imo eam libenter excepturos puto quam damus Epistolam, Latine quoque modo versam, cujus fragmentum à Petro Martyre editum, eruditorum animos pridem sollicitavit. Quis enim illud cum legerit, Joannis Chrysostomi mentem percipere possit, ex eoque animadvertere, quâ occasione, quo animo ejus verba * scripta sunt? In eâ porro Epistolâ mirari licet summam & insolitam Dei amantissimi viri charitatem, qui licet innumeris ærumnis oppressus esset, atque continuis terroribus ob Isaurorum IncurSIONES, ut ipse scribit in Epistolis ad Olympiadem, panè exanimaretur; nihilominus cum audisset Cæsarium, Monachum, amicum suum in Apollinaris & Ζωονιστῶν Hæresim incidisse, eum pro incredibili suâ bonitate ab Hæresi avertere, atque in sincere pietatis viam revocare hâc Epistolâ molitus est. Quantum vero Apollinaris Hæresis tunc grassaretur, & quàm multos invasisset, ex eo colligere licet, quod contra Apollinaristas & Synusiaſtas scripserunt Diodorus, Tarsensis Episcopus, quem supra memoravi, Gregorius Nyſſenus, Cyrillus Alexandrinus, Theodorus Mopsuestenus, Theophilus Antiochensis, ut alios plures omittam. Atque ut ab eo errore Cæsarium revocaret Joannes, eumque ad catholicam fidem, quæ duas in Christo naturas inconfusas sub unâ personâ confitetur, Epistolâ reduceret, comparisonem ab Eucharistia Sacramento mutuatur, in quo PANIS post consecrationem, non jam PANIS, sed CORPUS CHRISTI APPELLARE DIGNUS EFFICITUR; Etiamſi natura panis, inquit, in ipſo permansit, & non duo corpora, sed unum corpus Filii prædicatur. Quibus verbis sanctus Doctor veram ac realem, ut vocant, corporis Christi

* Lit. i. iij.
pag. altera.

Christi in Eucharistia presentiam supponit, & agnoscit; alia certe nulla esset cum humanâ ac divinâ in Christo naturâ Eucharistie comparatio. Ips: Chrysostomus Homil. 2. ad Populum Antiochensem: Ο μὲν γὰρ Ἡλίας μηλωτῷ ἀφῆκε τὴν μαθητῇ, ὃς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαβάνων, τῷ σάρκα ἡμῖν κατέλιπε τῷ αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Ἡλίας ἀποδυσαμῆς, ὃς Χριστὸς ἐκ ἡμῶν κατέλιπε, ἐσχον αὐτῷ ἀνῆλθε. "Elias enim pallium reliquit discipulo suo; Dei autem Filius ascendens in cœlum, nobis carnem suam reliquit: sed Elias se exuit, Christus vero & carnem suam nobis reliquit, ipsamque habens, ascendit. Et Hom. 83. in Matthæum: Οὐτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς μυστηρίων ποιῶντος ἐ τοῖς κειμήλοις μόνον ἐμβλέποντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ κερύωμεν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἀποδεδειγμένος, ἡ δὲ ἀσθησις ἡμῶν ἐνεξαπατήσθαι· ὅσα ἐδόκουν διέτεσε, αὐτὴ δὲ τὰ πλείονα σφάλλεται· ἐπεὶ ἐν ὁ λόγος φησὶ, τὸ τὸ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου, ἐ πεινῶμεθα, ἐ πνεύωμεν, ἐ νοητοῖς αὐτὸ βλέπωμεν ὁφθαλμοῖς. "Sic etiam in mysteriis faciamus, non illa quæ ante nos jacent, solummodo aspicientes, sed verba quoque ejus tenentes. Nam verbis ejus defraudari non possumus, sensus vero non ster deceptu facillimus est: illa falsa esse non possunt, hic sæpius atque sæpius fallitur. Quoniam ergo ille dixit, Hoc est corpus meum, obediamus, & credamus, & oculis intellectus id perspiciamus. Integrum librum conficerem, si ex Chrysostomo locos omnes exciperem, in quibus de sacratissima Eucharistia similiter loquitur; sed latius ac salubrius tibi erit, eos in fonte legisse.

Thus far Bigotius's Preface: As to the *Epistle* itself, I have publish'd it exactly as it was in the *Paris Edition*, whose *Pages* I have retain'd, that those who please, may see the Defect in that part of
Pal-

Palladius, out of which it was rased. For the little *Notes* which I have added, they contain a Collation, 1. Of the Latin of *Bigotius*, with the Latin of Mr. *le Moyne's* Copy, in which I do not know that I have omitted the least variation, even of a single Letter. 2. Of the *Greek Fragments* collected by *Bigotius*, with some other MSS. that have been communicated to me. In which, *A* denotes the *Arundel* MS. cited by Dr. *Cave* in his *Chartophylax Eccles. C.* one of Monsieur *Colbert's* Library, examined by the learned Monsieur *Alix. M.* the *Latin Copy* publish'd by Monsieur *le Moyne*.

EPISTOLA S. JOHAN. CHRYS.

Pag. 236. lit.
Gg. part. ak.
folii ed. Paris.

* ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ Τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἰω-
άννῃ τῷ Χρυσοστόμῳ
πρὸς Καισάρειον, μόναχον,
ἐν τῷ δ' Ἀπρίλιον αὐτῷ ἐξο-
ρίαν.

INCIPIT Epistola
B *Johannis* Episcopi
Constantinopolitani, ad
Cesarium, Monachum,
tempore secundi exilii
fui.

* Præter Authores à *Bigotio* laudatos, unde fragmenta Græca hujus Epistolæ collegit vir eruditissimus; extat alius *Nicephori* liber MS. in Biblioth. *Colbert.* continens quinque diversos tractatus. Ex secundo eorum contra *Mamonas* quædam collegit, & mecum communicavit reverendus D. P. *Alix.* Titulus autem in illo MS. ita se habet, pag. 222. Τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἰωάννῃ τῷ Χρυσοστόμῳ, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Καισάρειον μόναχον ἐπιστολῇ, μετὰ τῷ δ' Ἀπρίλιον αὐτῷ ἐξορίαν. Paulò aliter legitur hic titulus in antiquo codice Bibliothecæ *Arundelianæ* à R. D. D. *Cave* in *Chartoph. Eccles.* nuper edito, p. 69. Ἰωάννῃ Ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐν τῇ, &c. uti in MS. *Colbert.*

INSPEXIMUS

INSPEXIMUS li-
teras tuæ Reverentiæ:
inspeximus autem ^b non
^a præter ^c lachrymas.
Quomodo enim ^b non
^c lachrymabimur, & ani-
mam ipsam dolore con-
ficimus, videntes fratrem
singularem vitam à pue-
ritiâ eligentem, & ^d ἀ-
κραιφνῶς, id est, consum-
matè circa pietatem se
habentem, subito autem
^e hæreticorum jactibus
pulsus. “ Et dicas forsi-
“ tan ab errore ad id
“ quod melius est venis-
“ se Te, & gratiam con-
“ fiteri his, qui ^f admira-
“ bilem illum ^g protule-
“ rint librum, quem
“ magnum esse ^h optima
“ tua nominant scripta,
“ qui splendide prædicat
“ [ⁱ concursum essentia-
“ lem & commixtionem
“ sacram factam ex Divi-

Καὶ φήσεις πάντως ἐκ Anastas. in
πλάγης τοῦ πρῆτον MS. Colleg.
ἐπὶ λυδέναι, ἔχειν ὁμο- Clarom.
λογεῖν τοῖς τῶν θαυμαστῶν Nicephor. C.
ἐκείνῳ σοὶ θεοσχεμίστην P. in Antirr-
βιβλον, ἡ ἀρίστη τὰ her. MS. Bibl.
καλλιῶσι σε ἀποκαλῶσιν Calbert.
γαίμαται πλουτῶς Ἀνα-
γνώσκειν σωθεῖν ἡμῶν νοῦν
δὲ, ἔμειν θεοπεσίαν γε-
νηνταὶ θεότητος πρὸς τὸ παρ-
χρὸς μίαν πρὸς ἐν τῷ θεῷ
πελεδῶναι φύσιν * τῷ το

Var. lect. MS. M. * præter. ^b N. ^c lachrymas: lachrymabimur. ^d ἀκραιφνῶς. ^e Hæ-
reticorum. ^f Ammirabilem. ^g Protulerit. ^h Optime. [i Concursum essentialem sacram
facta ex Divinitate & Carnis unam autem ex hoc perfici naturam.]

* Alludit ad hunc locum vetus Author contra Severianos & Acephalos, à Tur-
riano editus, Bibl. Patr. Edit. 4. Tom. 4. ad fin. ubi post laudatum quendam Ambrosii
locum, subdit, *Chrysostomus ad Cæsarium Monachum.* Hæc est hæresis ipsissima introdu-
centium Mixtionem & Compositionem. Vid. Expostulationem p. X.

† Ταυ.

Pag. 237.
ediv. Paris.
Gg. iij.

† θαυμάσεις τῆ καὶ ἀπορίας.
Ἀπολινάριε τὸ ἀτόπημα.
αὕτη γὰρ εἰσαγγόντων κέρας
ἔ, συναλοιφῶν ἢ δυσεβέ-
σται ἀρεσις.

"nitare & Carne, unam
"autem ex hac perfici
"naturam.] Istud mira-
"bitur insipientis *Apol-*
"*linarii* inconsideratio,
"ista eorum qui intro-
"ducunt ^a contempera-
"tionem & ^b συναλοι-
"φῶν, id est, commixti-
"onem impiissima [^c in-
"tentio, quæ] proce-
"dens immutat quidem
"*Arrii*, *Apollinarii*, ^d &
"*Sabellii*, ^d & *Manetis* ni-
"hil. Passionem autem
"excogitari & adponi
"secundum illos *Uni-*
"geniti ^e imaginatur De-
"itati, quod ^f Christi-
"anis alienum est.

Posside igitur Temet-
ipsum iterum, Dilectis-
sime, & ad priorem re-
gredere ordinem ab abo-
minabili illâ abstinens
[^g opinione, quæ est *A-*
pollinaris, & eorum qui
Synusias dicuntur. Im-

† Locus hic corruptus videtur: Quid si legamus θαυμάσεις vel θαυμάσεις, ut sensus
sit, istud admiraberis, vel potius, istud admirari debuisses insani *Apollinaris* absurdum;
hæc quippe est Hæresis ipsissima, &c. ...

MS.M. ^a Contemplationem. ^b CYNΑΛΤΦΗΝ. [^c Intentioque.] ^d Et deest. ^e em-
ginatur. ^f Χριστιανισ. [^g Opinionem & qua *Apollinaris* & eorum qui *Synusias* di-
cuntur ipsa cogitatio assidue puris, &c.]

pia cogitatio assidua è
 puris] influens nocere
 novit, qui secundum nos
 sunt simplicitati con-
 viventes. ^a Ductoris enim
 eorum est liber, *Apollin-*
arii ^b dico; ^c etsi hunc
 sibi tua Reverentia non
 rectè faciens negotiata
 est. Verum tamen nos
 recordantes tuæ nobis-
 cum conversationis, sen-
 tientes autem ex his quæ
 scripsistis, errorem sub-
 sistere erga tuam dilecti-
 onem ex illorum insipi-
 entia non solum erga dis-
 pensationis ^d mysterium,
 magis autem & erga No-
 minum conjunctionem,
 excogitavimus Deo co-
 operante nostræ infirmi-
 tati de omnibus mani-
 festam ostentationem fa-
 cere, ad redargutionem
 quidem ^e malæ opinio-
 nis eorum qui ^f hæreti-
 cum Tibi protulerunt li-
 brum,* correctionem au-
 tem tuæ venerationis.

^g Deum ergo quando
 dicis, Dilectissime, ag-

* Edit. *Parif.*
 pag. 238.

^a MS. M. Doctoris. ^b Dico, abest, ^c Et si. ^d Misterium. ^e Male. ^f Ereticum.
^g Dominum.

novisti id quod simplex
est ^a naturæ, quod in-
compositum, quod in-
convertibile, quod invi-
sibile, quod immortale,
quod incircumscribibile,
quod incomprehensibi-
le, & istis similia. Ho-
minem autem dicens, sig-
nificasti id quod natu-
ræ est ^b infirmum, eluri-
tionem, sitim, super *La-*
χρῆμα lachrymas, ^c me-
tum, sudoris ejectionem,
& his similia, quibus id
quod divinum est extra
[est. “^a Christum au-
tem] quando dicis
“conjunxisti utrumque,
“unde & passibilis di-
“catur idem ipse & ^e im-
“passibilis, passibilis qui-
“dem carne, impassibi-
“lis autem Deitate. Ea-
“dem ipsa & de Filio, &
“Christo, & Jesu, &
“Domino prædicantur.
“Communia enim ista,
“& [^f susceptibilia dua-
“rum] Essentiarum no-
“mina sunt; quarum
conjunctio in hæreticis

Anastaf. in
MS. Clarom.

Χρῆσιν ὃ ὅταν εἴπῃς σω-
ψας ἐκείνους, ὅθεν ἐ πα-
θησὶ λέγειτ' ἂν ὁ αὐτὸς ἐ
ἀπαθὴς. παθητὶς μὲν Γερ-
μὶ, ἀπαθὴς ὃ θεόπῃ.
παῦται δὲ ἐ ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμῶν, ἐ
Ἰησοῦ, ἐ κυρίου, κατη-
ρεῖται κρινὰ γὰρ παῦται, ἐ
δεκλῆσθαι τῶν δύο ἐσῶν τὰ
ὀνόματα

Edit. Paris.
239. lit. Gg. 4.

MS. M. ^a Nature. ^b Infirmum. ^c Meum. [^d ἔχον δὴ] ^e Im-passibilis, deficit in,
spatio tamen relicto ubi olim fuerit. ^f XPO. & Inū. & dnō. [^g Susceptibili avarum]

qui-

quidem errorem facit,
proprio pro communi u-
tentes nomine [^a Christi
uno. His autem] com-
munibus istis ^b uti oportet
Nominibus quando
dispensationis confiten-
dum est mysterium. Si
enim ^c Deum dixeris per-
tulisse, qualicumque ^d co-
gitatione quod *impossi-
bile est, dixisti, id quod
Blasphemum est, [^e & in
*Manetis, &] in alio-
rum ^f hæresim declinasti.
Impietatem, si iterum
hominem dixeris qui
pertulit, inveniris purum
ædificans templum. Tem-
plum † Crucis extra in-
habitantem nunquam di-
citur, quia jam non est
Templum. Et forsitan
dicunt, & quomodo ^g Do-
minus dixit, *Ut quid me
vultis occidere hominem
qui veritatem vobis locu-
tus sum quam audiri à
^h Deo ?* Benè & omninò

*Edit. Paris.
pag. 239.

[Joan. 8. 40.]

MS. M. [^a XPI unos autem.] ^b Uti oportet, deest. ^c dm. ^d Cogitationem. [^e Et
immane scd.] ^f Hæresum.

* Sic videtur legendum; & in Manetis, & in aliorum Hæresum declinasti impietatem.
Sij iterum, &c.

† Forte melius carnis.

MS. D. *le Moine.* ^g Dns. ^h dō.

A a 2

fapi.

sapienter hoc dicendum est. [^a Neque enim ex hoc ab Inhabitantibus de- fraudabatur.] sed signifi- care volens patientem naturam hominis memo- riam fecit, propter quod & ^b Deus & Homo ^c Chri- stus : ^b Deus propter impassibilitatem, Homo propter Passionem. U- nus filius, unus ^d Domi- nus, idem ipse proculdu- bus unitarum naturarum, unam dominationem, u- nam potestatem possi- dens, ^e etiamsi non ^f con- substantiales existunt, [^g & unaquæque ^h in- commixtam Proprietatis conservat agnitionem, propter hoc quod ⁱ in- confusa sunt, dico.] Si- cut enim antequam ^k san- ctificetur PANIS PA- NEM nominamus, divi- nâ autem illum*¹ Sancti- ficante Gratiâ, mediante Sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ^m APPELLATI-

*Edit. Paris.
pag. 240.

MS M [^a Neque enim ex inhabitantibus de fraudabatur deitate] ^b ds. ^c Est Christus, Mar- tyr l. c. in tract. de Euchar. Oxon. MS. M. ^e XPS. ^d dns. ^e Etiam si. ^f Consubstantia- liter Martyr. [^g MS M. Et unaquæque in quo mixtam proprietatis conservat agnitionem prop- ter hoc quod inconfusa sunt duo.] ^h Incommixta. Martyr. ib. ⁱ Inconfusa sint duo. Id. ^k MS. M. Scificetur. ¹ Scificante. grâ. Id. ^m Ab Appellatione. Ibid.

ONE

ONE PANIS, dignus
autem habitus est ^a DO-
MINICI CORPORIS
APPELLATIONE, eti-
amsi NATURA PANIS
in ipso permanfit, & non
duo Corpora sed ^b unum
Corpus filii ^c prædicatur:
sic & * hic Divinâ ^d ἐνι-
δρυσάσης, id est inun-
dante corporis naturâ,
“unum filium, unam
“personam, utraque hæc
“fecerunt. Agnoscen-
“dum tamen inconfu-
“sam & indivisibilem
“rationem, non in unâ
“solùm naturâ, sed in
“duabus perfectis. Si
“enim unius, quomodo
“idquod inconfusum est,
“quomodo quod indivi-
“sibile, quomodo uni-
“tio dicitur aliquando?
“[^e Sibimet ipsi enim uni-
“ri quæ] una est, aut con-
“fundi, aut dividi im-
“possibile est. Quod
“ergo infernum evomu-

ἡ τὴν καὶ νταῦθα τῆς θείας ἐνι- Nicephor.
δρυμένης τῷ σώματι φύ. Anastas.
σεως, ἕνα υἱόν, ἐν πρὸς ὧν πιν, Joan. Da-
μασθεν. mascen.
τὸ σωμαφόρεα ἀπέπελε To. IV. Var.
σεν γνωρίζομενον μέντοι lect. Canib.
ἀσυγχύτως. * ἀδιαρέτω λό- p. 211.
γῶν ἕκ ἐν μιᾷ φύσει. ἄλλ’ f. φ. χ.
ἐν δυὶν πλείους. ἐπὶ γδ
μιᾷς, πῶς τὸ ἀσυγχύτον;
πῶς τὸ ἀδιαρέτον; πῶς ἡ Theorianus
ἐνωσις λεχθεῖται πτε; αὐτῇ in legatione
γδ τὴν μίαν ἐνωσιν. ἡ Κυρ- ad Armenios.
P. 74.
χεῖδος, ἡ διαρείδου ἀδυνατον.
ποῖον ἐν αἰδῆς ἐξηρέυσατο,
μὴν ἐπὶ χειρὶ λέγειν φύ-
σιν;

MS. M. ^a Dominicæ. ^b Unus, ^c Prædicamus.

* Hic Martyr loc. cit. Hæc. Totum hunc locum post Turrianum in Edit. Damasceni, sic citat Albertinus de Euch. l. 2. p. 532. Sic & hic divinâ ἐνιδρυσάσης insidente cor-
pori natura, &c.

MS. M. ^d ENIΔΡΥCΑCHC. [^e Sibimet ipsi unirique.]

“it,”

* Quæ sequuntur exant apud Jo. Damascenum.

* Edit. Paris.
pag. 24 I.
lit. Hh.

" it, unam in ^a Christo
" naturam dicere putamus * divinam solam
" nominantes, non omni modo unam negant,
" ^b nostram, dico, salutem
" aut humanam retinentes, non divinæ abnegationem faciunt, ^c dicuntque perdidit quod
" proprium erat. Si enim unus est, salva nobis est unitio ^d omni modo, & ea quæ uniti
" tioni sunt propria, salvari necesse est: Si * enim non, nec unitio,
" sed confusio & abolitio.
Mox autem ad Interrogationis fluctuantes resolutionem, ad aliquid aliud exiliunt, quod non sit proprium ad Interrogationem: & inconstantes emittunt Voces; Pertulit ^e Deus & non pertulit, & si petantur modum dicere, ad ignorantiam recedunt, proferentes; Quomodo ^f voluit Christi apud ipsos memoria fugiente post-

^a XPO. ^b Nam, ^c Dicunt quæ. ^d Omni modo. ^e Dicit. ^f Voluit XPI.

hæc a vituperari in hoc?
 Mox dicunt, & b Christus
 non est c Deus sed & Ho-
 mo. Et iterum dicunt,
 Post d Unitionem non o-
 portet dicere duas natu-
 ras. Attende significa-
 tionem dicti. Unitio-
 nem dixisti: unius uni-
 tionem non invenis fieri,
 quomodo e prævenientes
 diximus, sed *Verbum Caro*
factum est & f specularē
 eorum querentur subtili-
 tatem. Intulit enim, &
inhabitavit in nobis. Nun-
 quid non ibi videtur,
 g quia aliud est quod in-
 habitat præter habitatio-
 nem. Si cognovissent,
 nunquam h Dominum glo-
 ria crucifixissent. Domi-
 num iterum quando dix-
 eris, non proprium sed
 Commune i significatur
 nomen, Passionis & Im-
 passibilitatis susceptibile.
 Consueverant autem &
 istud * prætereundum puta-
 mus: Non Corpus k dei
 & sanguinem accipimus,

Joan. 1. 24.

1 Cor. 11. 8.

* Edit. Paris.
pag. 242.

MS. D. *le Moine*. a Vituperati. b XPS. c Ds. d Unitatem. e Prævenientes. f Specula-
 neorum. g Qui. h Dnm. i Significat. k Di.

fideliter

fideliter ac ^a piè suscipi-
 endum, non quia Cor-
 pus & sanguinem possi-
 det id quod divinum est
 naturâ, sed quia ^b ea quæ
 Carnis sunt, propria fa-
 cit. O inconsideratio !
 O impia Cogitatio ! pe-
 riclitatur enim apud ip-
 sos dispensationis Myste-
 rium, & iterum Domi-
 nicum corpus, sicut ^c ve-
 rum corpus confiteri non
 patiuntur : per cogitati-
 onem enim dici conver-
 sum ^d esse hoc in deita-
 tem imaginantur, unam
 hinc construentes natu-
 ram, & ipsam cujus sit
 non ^e juvantes dicere, ut
 passionem divinitati; un-
 dique secundum Apolli-
 narium excogitantes, de-
 cidant à ^f præmissis bonis
 putamus non ^g contrem-
 iscent ista dicere audi-
 entes. Non cogitant æ-
 ternum judicium, & ^h Do-
 mini vocem dicentis, E-
 go sum & non ⁱ immutor.
 Caro infirma ^k Spiritus

Malac. 3.6.
 Mat. XXVI. 41.

MS.M. ^a Piac. ^b Ea deest. ^c Unum corpus. ^d Eti. ^e Invenientes. ^f Pmissis. ^g con-
 tremescant. ^h dñi. ⁱ Immutor. ^k Sps.

antem

autem promptus * Pater si
possibile est transeat à me
calix iste. † Tristis est ani-
ma mea usque ad mortem.
|| Palpate & videte, quia
a Spiritus carnem & ossa
non habet sicut me videtis
habere. Putamus Deita-
ti ista apta sunt. Audi-
ant & Petrum dicentem
* b Christo pro nobis pas-
so carne, & non dixit
Deitate. Et iterum, Tu es
Christus filius Dei vivi:
Viventis dixit, non mo-
rientis. Et quæcunque
his similia divina nos e-
docet Scriptura, cui vio-
lenti esse Hæretici non
desistunt. Horum istas
novitates * vocum decli-
nantes, d Charissime,
“ ad id quod præjacet, re-
vertamur; pium & val-
de pium, c Christum
“ qui morte circumdatus
“ est, confiteri in divini-
tate perfectum, & in
“ humanitate perfectum,
“ unum filium unigeni-
tum, non dividendum
“ in filiorum dualitatem,

* Sp. b XPO. c XPS. d Charissimæ. * XPm.
* Εὐσεβὲς & deest in MS. A. † Περικλυδέτω, MS. C. .: Ομολογῶμεν. MS. A. .: & ἐν
ἀνθρώπότητι τέλειον, ib. deest.

* Ibid. 39.

† — Ibid. 38.

|| Luk. 24. 39.

* Edit. Paris.
pag. 243.
Lit. Hh. 1j.
Mat. 16. 16.

Τέτων τὰς ^c κενοφωνίας Anast.
ὁκκλίνοντες, ἀγαπῶντες, εἰς τὸ ^c Καινοφωνί-
α, ^{as} περιεχόμενον ἐπ' ἀνέλεστωμεν.
* Εὐσεβὲς ἐ λῖαν δύσβες
τὸν θανάτῳ † περιβλη-
θέντα χριστὸν .: ὁμολογεῖν,
ὅτι Θεότητι τέλειον, .: & ἐν
ἀνθρώπότητι τέλειον, ἵνα
ἡ ὁμολογία, ἢ διακρίμενον

εἰς ἑὸν δαδά, φέρονταδὶ
 ἔμμε ἐν αὐτῷ τῶν ἀχωρί-
 σαν δύο φύσεων ἀσυχύτης
 ταῖς ιδιότηταις, ἐκ ἄλλου ἔ-
 ἄλλον, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλ' ἔτα-
 ἔ τὸν αὐτὸν Κύριον, Ἰησοῦν,
 Θεόν, Λόγον, Ἄρχα || ἡμετέ-
 ραν ἡμφισμένον, ἔ† αὐτῷ
 ἐκ ἀψυχῶν ἔ ἀνοῶν, ὡς
 ὁ δυναβὴς Ἀπολινάριου.

In MS collect.
 Biblioth. reg.
 Gall. n. 1026.
 p. 247.

* εἶπεν. ∴ Τύτῃς τὸν νοῦν
 θεωροῦμεν, φύρωμεν τὴς δι-
 αϊρεῦντας. ἔ γδ ἔ δὲ τῇ ἡ
 φύσις, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀδαίρεταις ἔ
 || ἀδαίρετας ἡένωσις ἐν ἐνὶ
 τῆς ὑότητος ἐμολογημένη
 θεωρώπῳ, ἔ μᾶ ἡπασσῃ.
 φύρωμεν τὴς μίαν φύσιν μετὰ
 ἡ ἐνωσιν περπυομένης, τῇ
 γδ τῆς μᾶς ἐπινόια τῷ ἀπα-
 θεῖ Θεῷ πάδος θεωράπῃ
 ἐπεύρονται, ἡ οἰκονομίαν ἀρ-
 νέμῃ, ἔ τῷ Διαβόλῳ
 ἡ γένναν θεωρπαζόντες.
 Ταῦτα διὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς
 ἐπιστολῆς ἀρκεῖν εἰς ἀσφά-
 λειαν ἡ γῆμει τῆς σῆς ἀγάπης,
 δαυμάσεις.

Edit. Paris.
 p. 244.

“ dispensationem abnegantes, & Diaboli Gehennam
 “ arripientes. Ista propter mensuram Epistolæ suf-
 “ ficere arbitror, ad confirmationem tuæ dilectionis,
 “ ὁ magnifice.

“ portantem tamen in
 “ semetipso indivisarum
 “ duarum naturarum in-
 “ convertibiliter propri-
 “ etates, non alterum &
 “ alterum, absit, sed u-
 “ num & eundem ∴ Do-
 “ minum, ∴ Jesum, ∴ De-
 “ um, Verbum, carne
 “ nostrā amictum, &
 “ ipsā non inanimatā,
 “ aut irrationabili, sicut
 “ impius ^h Apollinarius
 “ dixit. Istis mentem in-
 “ tendamus, fugiamus
 “ eos qui dividunt. ⁱ Nam
 “ etsi duplex natura, ve-
 “ runtamen indivisibilis
 “ & indissipabilis unitio,
 “ in unā filiationis conf-
 “ tenda personā, & una
 “ ^k substantia. Fugiamus
 “ qui unam naturam post
 “ unionem prodigali-
 “ ter dicunt; unius enim
 “ cogitatione impassibi-
 “ li Deo passionem ad-
 “ jungere impelluntur,

MS. M. ∴ Dnm. ∴ Ihm. ∴ dm. ^h Apollinarius. ⁱ Nam etsi enim. ^k Substantia.
 π ἡμετέραν δεεῖται in A. † αὐτῷ, ib. * εἶπεν. ib. ∴ τῇ pro τῷ, ib. || ἀπαίρετας ib.

“Explicit

Explicit * Epistola B. Joannis Episcopi Constantino-
politani ad Cæsarium, Monachum, tempore secun-
di exilii sui. Amen.

* Epistula.

NUM. VI.

*Having, to satisfy the Vindicator, used such exactness
in my Quotations, as to refer, for the most part,
to the very Pages where they are; it was thought
fit, if it may be, to prevent all future Cavil, that
I should here subjoin this following Account of the
Editions made use of by me.*

A.

A Quinatis summa Theologiæ, Fol. Colon. 1662.
Articles of the Church of England. See Sparrow.
Arcudius de concordia Ecclesiæ Occidentalis & Orienta-
lis, Fol. Paris 1626.
Albertinus de Eucharistia, Fol. Daventriæ 1654.
Arnauld Perpetuité de la Foy de l'Eglise Catholique
touchant l'Eucharistie, 5 Edit. 8vo. Paris 1672.
Amicable Accommodation, &c.

B.

Bellarmini Controversiæ 3 Vol. Ingolstadii 1586.
Idem de Indulgentiis, 8vo. Colonia 1599.
Blondel of the Sybilline Oracles, Engl. Fol. Lond. 1661.
Breviarium Romanum, 8vo. Antverpiæ 1572.
Bramhal's Works, Fol. Dublin 1677.
Bigotius vita Chrysostomi per Palladium, G. L. 4to. Paris
1680.
Balsamon in Concilia in Synodico, Oxonii 1672.
Bonæ Card. opera 3 Vol. 8vo. Paris 1676, 1677.

B b 2

Nou-

Nouvelles de la repub. de Lettres Mr. B—— Juin 1686.

C.

Crasset, veritable Devotion, &c. 4to. Paris 1679.

Card. Capisucchi Capit. Theol. selec.

Concilia Labei 18 Vol. Paris.

Common Prayer of the Church of *England*.

Claude Réponse au pere Nouet, 8vo. Amsterdam 1668.

Cosins History of Popish Transubstantiation, 8vo. Lond. 1679.

Cassandri opera, Paris 1616.

Ejusd. Consultatio, 8vo. Vid. Grotii via ad pacem.

Cajetanus Card. in D. Thomam, Venetiis 1612.

Ejusd. Comment. in S. Scr. Lugduni.

Canones, &c. Concil. Trident. 12mo. Colonia 1679.

Calvisii Chronologia, Fol. Francofurti 1650.

Cave, Chartophylax Ecclesiasticus, 8vo. Lond. 1685.

D.

Dallæus adversus Latinorum de cultus religiosi objecto Traditionem. 4to. Geneva. 1664.

Idem de Pœnis & Satisfactionibus Amstærl. 1649.

Durandus in sententias, Lugduni 1569.

E.

Estius in Sententias, Paris 1672.

Euchologium cum Notis Goar. Paris 1647.

Expostulatio de Joan. Chrysost. Epist. suppressa, Lond. 1682. 4to.

Epiphaniï opera Gr. Lat. Colonia 1682.

L'Esprit de Mr. Arnauld 2 Vol. 8vo. Deventer. 1684.

F.

Forbesii instructiones Historico-Theologicæ, Amst. 1645.

G.

Grotius via ad pacem, cum consult. Cassandri, 8vo. 1642.

Gregorii Nazianzeni opera, Gr. Lat. Paris 1609.

—— Invektiva in Julianum, 4to. Etonæ 1610.

Gregorii Papæ liber Sacrament. Menardi, 4to. Edit. Paris 1642.

Gratiani decretum, Fol. Paris 1585.

Gamachæus.

Godefry vie de S. Athanase 2 Vol. 4. Paris 1679.

Idem vie de S. Basile 2 Vol. 4. Paris 1679.

Hooker

H.

Hookers Ecclesiastical Polity, Fol. Lond. 1676.
Book of Homilies, Oxford 1683.

I.

Index expurgatorius, Fol. Madriti 1667.
Jesuits Loyalty collect. of several Treatises, 4to. Lond. 1677
Instruction pour gagner le Jubilé, 12mo. Paris 1683.
Jurieux Preservatif contre le Changement de Religion. 8vo.
— Le Janseniste convaincu de vaine Sophistiquerie,
Amst. 1683.
— Prejuger legitimes contre le Papisme, 4to. 1685.
Innocent the XI. Bull for an universal Jubile upon the re-
lief of Vienna, *August* 11th. 1683.

L.

Ludolphi Historia Æthiopica Lat. Fol. Francofurti. 1681.
Lombardi sententiarum libri 4. 8vo. Moguntia 1632.

M.

Maldonate in Prophetas majores, 4to. Moguntia 1611.
— In Evangelia, Fol. Moguntia 1611.
Missale Romanum, 8vo. Paris 1616.
Missale in usum Sarum, Fol. 1527.
Stephani le Moyne varia sacra, 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1685.
Petri Martyris de Eucharistia.
Monsieur Maimbourg peaceable Method, *Engl.* 4to.
Monsieur de Meaux's Exposition, *Engl.* 4to. 1685.
— *French* 5 Edition, 12mo. à Paris 1681.
Traité de la Communion sous les deux Especes, 12mo.
Paris 1682.
— Pastoral Letter, *Engl.* 4to. 1686.

N.

Noüet de la presence de J. C. dans le tres saint Sacra-
ment, 4to. Paris 1666.
Nicole, Prejuges legitimes contre les Calvinistes. Paris 1679
— Les P. R. convaincus de schisme, 8vo. Paris 1684.

O.

Officium B. Virginis, 8vo. Antverpia 1631.
Office of the holy Week, Lat. English, 8vo. Paris 1670.

P.

Pontificale Romanum, Fol. Venetiis 1561.
La Politique du Clergé de France, 12mo. Amst. 1682.

Du

Du Perron Replique à la reponse du Roy de la Grande Bretagne, Fol. Paris 1620.

Du Perron de l'Eucharistie, Fol. Paris 1629.

Petavius Dogmata Theologica, Fol. Paris 1650.

Papist represented and misrepresented, 1st. Edition. 1685

Pajon Examen du livre qui portepourtitre Prejugez legitimes contre les Calvinistes, 2 Vol. 12mo. à Bionne 1673.

R.

Reponse à un escrit public contre les Miracles de la Sainte Espine.

Seconde Reponse à Monsieur de Condom, 8vo. 1680.

Ruffinus.

Rituale Romanum, 4to. Antverpiæ 1620.

Reflexions Generales sur l'Exposition de Monsieur de Meaux, 8vo. à Cologne de Brandebourg 1685.

S.

Sparrow's Collection of Canons, &c. 4to. Lond. 1684.

Sexti Senensis Bibliotheca, Fol. Colonia 1586.

Suarez opera, Fol. Moguntia 1604 in 3 p. D. Th. 1610.

Scotus in sententias, primitive Letter, Fol.

Socrates, Sozomen, Fol. Paris Edit. Valesii.

T.

Thomasi codex Sacramentorum, 4to. Romæ 1680.

Theodoret. opera 5 Vol. G. L. Fol. Paris 1642.

Theophilus, Turrianus, citati ab Albertino.

V.

Vasquez in D. Thomam, Ingolstadtii 1606. in 3 part. Venetiis 1610.

Vindication of the B. of Condom's Exposition.

Vincentius Lirinensis. Gregorius de Valentia, apud Albertinum.

Z.

Zonaras in Concilia : In synodico Oxoniensi. 1672.

ERRATA.

Pag. xvii. lin. 26. of the read of *their*. pag. i. l. 4. *these* r. *those*. pag. 8. l. 26. marg. *and this is*. pag. 20. l. ult. p. 209. r. 249. pag. 26. r. *hard* put to prove. p. 94. l. 23. p. 30. r. p. 23. pag. 95. l. 19. Art. 5. 27. pag. 125. l. 8. of r. to. l. 18. *I have*. pag. 151. not. *lacrimas*, *luchrimabimus*. Some literal Faults there are besides these, which the Reader may please to correct.

Add to pag. 114. lin. 24.

But why do I thus long insist upon Probabilities? Monsieur de Meaux himself owns that he hath both seen and read the *Preservative*; and in his Treatise of *Communion*, does particularly encounter what Monsieur *Jurieu* had therein advanced against his *Exposition*: And yet has this man, after all, the Confidence to tell the World not only that *he never read Father Crasser's Book*, which is very improbable, but that he *never* so much as "*heard it mentioned, that there was any thing in it contrary to his* Exposition; tho' that Author, in that very Book, has spent no less than * six or seven Pages on purpose to prove it; not to say any thing of the † many other Treatises, and some of them *Answers* to his *Exposition* too, but all of them well known in France, that have done the same.

Vindicat.
p. 10.
* Pag. 97, 98,
99, 100, 101,
102, 103.
† Such are
among others.
M. la B. an-
swer to his
Advertisement
p. 79.
Reflexions

Generales sur l' *Exposition* de M. de Meaux, p. 121, 144. M. Arnaud reponse au *Preservatif*. M. *Jurieu's* Vindication: le Janseniste convaincu de vaine Sophistiquerie, p. 72, &c. L' *Esprit* de M. Arnauld, Vol. 2. p. 174. Politique du Clergé de France, p. 67.

He that can believe this, let him also believe, that M. de Meaux had no hand in the first Edition of his *Exposition*; That the Sorbonne Doctors never corrected it, nor he suppress'd it upon that account; That that whole Edition was condemned only to make some little Alterations for the benefit of the
Me.

MS 34
7
*Pastoral Letter, p. 3, 4

Method, and the *greater neatness of the Discourse and Style*. In a word, That what he has so shamefully asserted in his late * *Pastoral Letter*, as to a certain Point, which I shall beg leave not to name, but which we can at any time bring him thousands to contradict, he either ever *believed himself*, or ever *heard any other Bishops say*; all which, as they have been shewn to be *equally credible*, so no doubt are they *equally true* too.

FINIS.
